SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
10017047764



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

NNL

Diatessarica

PART III

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT



AGENTS IN AMERICA
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

555
13
A.3

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT

AN ATTEMPT TO REACH THROUGH VARYING VOICES THE ABIDING WORD

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

"The *letter* killeth, the *spirit* giveth life."
St Paul.

"I am the *voice* of one crying in the wilderness."
St John the Baptist.

"Thou hast the *words* of eternal life."
St Peter.

LONDON
Adam and Charles Black
1903

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TO THE UNKNOWN AUTHOR
OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL
THE NOBLEST ATTEMPT AT INDIRECT BIOGRAPHY
WHERE DIRECT BIOGRAPHY WAS IMPOSSIBLE

KIEL ST 13 57

PREFACE

THE original object of this treatise[1] was to investigate the truth about Voices alleged in the Gospels to have come from Heaven. But the investigation—besides indicating that the Voices were of the nature of "the word of the Lord" in the Old Testament, spiritual, not material—led incidentally to other conclusions, some of which, if true, seemed of great importance[2]. For example, it appeared almost demonstrable that Luke and Tertullian were right in omitting the clause "Deliver us from the Evil One (*or*, from evil)," the former from his Gospel, the latter from his separate and sectional commentary on the Lord's Prayer[3]. Again, analysis shewed that the precept about "taking up the cross" might with great probability be regarded as a Western paraphrase of the Jewish precept to "take on oneself the yoke" —the (Jewish) "yoke" of the Kingdom of Heaven being confused with the (Roman) crucificial "yoke" borne by the condemned on his way to the Cross,

[1] See p. 14. [2] See pp. 14—20.

[3] See **971** (i). Tertullian gives seven separate sections of comment to seven clauses of the Prayer, but no section to this (the eighth) clause, which he mentions merely as an illustration or interpretation of the seventh.

which "yoke" was sometimes identified with the Cross itself[1]. A third conclusion was, that in the Descent of the Spirit on our Lord, the words "as a dove"—if not an error of translation—appeared not originally intended to imply visibility.

These conclusions were obtained by the method indicated in *Clue*[2]—the only method lawful for science—by ascending from the *known* to the unknown. We *know* instances where varying Greek versions, those of the LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, and others, have ramified from one Hebrew Original, owing to erroneous translation. Tabulating these instances we can compare them with the Greek of the three Synoptists and ascertain whether they, too, deviate from one another in a manner corresponding to the deviations that we have found in the Old Testament. If they do, there results a probability that the Synoptic deviations also proceed from mistranslation of Hebrew: just as mistranslation of the French "suis" might be inferred from two parallel documents one of which had the word "am" whereas the other had "follow".

But in this volume use has also been made of the analogy of the Targums of the Old Testament. Some of these explain or amplify, besides translating. It is antecedently probable that, if there were early Christian traditions in Biblical Hebrew, some of the translators into Aramaic, Greek, and Syriac, would amplify, as well as translate. If so, the phenomena

[1] See **928** (i)—(x).

[2] The first vol. of this Series, see p. xxxiv.

of the Jewish Targums may illustrate many of the problems of the Gospels. At all events the Targumistic phenomena are of great literary interest and should be studied by all who are not afraid of facts, and who are willing, as Plato says, to "follow the Logos" in pursuit of Him whom they call the Word. Those who base their belief in Jesus of Nazareth not alone on the four precious pamphlets called Gospels, taken by themselves, but on the whole Book of the Universe, animate and inanimate—of which the pamphlets are but a part though a most important one—will feel sure that if they persist in "following the Logos" over mountain and mire, through light, twilight, and darkness, they will ultimately find that they have been drawing near to Christ. Only they must be sure that it *is* the Logos, and not the passion for research, or the hope of heaven, or the fear of hell—or the contemptible craving to "shout with the largest crowd," disguising itself as a "kindly light" and expressing itself decorously in the Latin adage "securus judicat orbis terrarum."

In any case—risking the charge of presumption—I will be bold enough to assert that the Gospels have never yet been fairly, because they have never yet been fully, criticized. Our Lord was a Jew. So were the Apostles. They all heard in their synagogues the Scriptures read in (probably) unintelligible Hebrew, and interpreted for them in Aramaic Targums, or, in St Paul's case, perhaps in that Greek Targum[1] which

[1] "Targum" means simply "translation" or "interpretation". A Jew

we commonly call the Septuagint. Further, they all heard unwritten traditions about the Scriptures, traditions not reduced to writing till some centuries after Christ's birth, but still preserving (in the two Talmuds) ancient sayings that go back to the first century or earlier. It was under these Targumist and Talmudist influences that the Apostles taught and that their teaching was recorded by their successors as "Memoirs of the Apostles," or Gospels. One Apostle, and only one, Matthew, is said by Papias (our earliest authority on the subject) to have himself written. But Papias goes on to say that Matthew wrote in Hebrew and that people "interpreted"—or, as the Jews would say, Targumized—"as best they could[1]." In the face of these undisputed facts—since it is certain that Jesus and the Twelve *thought* in Aramaic, and highly probable that some author identified in very early days with Matthew *wrote* in Hebrew—surely we must admit that the Gospels of the New Testament will not have been fully criticized until critics have carefully studied those ancient interpretations of the Old Testament, Aramaic as well as Greek, which illustrate the confusions of word and statement, transmutations of thought, and amplifications of history into legend, experienced in passing from the dead Hebrew to the living Targum,

might speak about the Targum of the LXX, as he would about the Targum of Onkelos. The former is less faithful than the latter; the former is Greek, the latter is Aramaic. But both would be called by a Jew Targums.

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. 16.

and from the languages of the East to the "Common Dialect" of the West.

If this is admitted, then my thesis is proved; for, though the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch were translated by Etheridge forty years ago, and the last page contained an advertisement of the Targum on some of the Prophets as "in preparation", the published work is out of print and the promised one has never been published. The reason is obvious. There was, and there is, no demand for it. Yet almost any flimsy speculation about some imaginary document such as Ur-Marcus[1]—a mere word, but one of those deadly words that, "as a Tartar's bow, do shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle and pervert the judgement"—will find, if not a great demand, at all events immediate publication.

Grant that some of these Aramaic Targums are fancifully, say even wildly, erroneous. Grant that they intermix legend, or poetry, with the Biblical text. Yet, as representing the national thought, literature, and theology, they are historical phenomena well worth considering. Cobwebs, in a sense, they may be, but petrified cobwebs, fifteen centuries old, converted from fly-traps into instructive monuments of antiquity. They illustrate on every page the differences between the West and the East, and between legends derived from bards and legends derived from scribes. Besides,

[1] See p. xxxvi (*c*).

even where the Aramaic is furthest verbally from the Hebrew—say, in the Targum on the Suffering Servant in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah—the Greek, though closer to the letter of the Original, will be found, in parts, inferior to the Aramaic in spiritual fidelity. In any case, faithful or unfaithful, the Aramaic versions are facts bearing on the interpretation of our Gospels, and, as facts, should be studied. I plead for more facts. Except in the region of Greek illustration, there is a dearth of facts, but a plethora of hypotheses, and of dogmatic reiterations based on authoritative but erroneous assertions. Sheep-path-criticism following authority in clean-cut paths that lead no-whither, spider-criticism evolving self-deceptions that deceive others—these there are in plenty. But of bee-criticism there is not enough. I plead for the bees.

I have again to express my thanks for general revision to the two friends who revised the *Corrections of Mark*. Particular obligations are acknowledged in the passages where they occur.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

Wellside,
Hampstead.
16 *June*, 1903.

CONTENTS

PAGE

SUMMARY . . . . . xiii—xxxiii

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS . . xxxiv—xxxvi

INTRODUCTION I (ON THE HONESTY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL)

Summary. The Fourth Gospel may have been written by one who considered himself but the pen of John the son of Zebedee, and who gave unity to the preaching and revelations of the latter; and this theory may be illustrated from the Targums of the Pentateuch . . . . . 1—11

INTRODUCTION II (ON THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK)

Summary. Why does John omit the Voice from Heaven in his account of the Baptism? Why does he omit the whole narrative of the Transfiguration (including the Voice)? Why do the Synoptists omit the Johannine Voice? Why do Luke and John alone mention prayer as occurring before the Voice? How account for the evangelistic differences as to Christ's single short prayer? What use can be made of non-canonical accounts of the Baptism and the Transfiguration?

In his differences from his predecessors as to (1) the Baptism, (2) the Transfiguration, (3) Christ's prayer, (4) "glory," and (from Matthew and Luke) as to (5) the nature of the divine Sonship, John is probably closer than the Synoptists to the historical and the spiritual truth . . . . . 12—24

BOOK I

THE BAPTISM

CHAPTER I

DIFFERENT ACCOUNTS OF THE BAPTISM

§ 1 The texts in English: the arrangement (553), Synoptists (554), John (555), Arabic Diatessaron (556), Justin Martyr (557—9), Celsus (560—5), Testament of the XII Patriarchs (566—9), Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes (570—2), Ephrem Syrus (573—7), Gospel of the Ebionites (578—81), Sibylline Oracles (582—5), Epiphanius (586—91)

§ 2 The differences to be considered: What was said by the Voice? What was seen? Who saw it? (592—6)

CHAPTER II

WHAT PRECEDED THE BAPTISM?

§ 1 Canonical accounts: (Matthew) "to be baptized" (597—8)

§ 2 Non-canonical accounts: "beseeching," or "not needing," to be baptized (599—605)

§ 3 "I need to be baptized by thee," origin of this tradition (606—9)

Summary. "Was baptized" originated "to be baptized"; this gave rise to various traditions about Jesus "*not needing*" to be baptized, and about the Baptist "*beseeching*" to be baptized.

CHAPTER III

THE PLACE OF THE BAPTISM

§ 1 Divergences (**610—1**)

§ 2 Where was Jesus baptized? (**612—6**)

Summary. Hebrew ambiguity originated various traditions, such as, "*in* Jordan," "*near* Jordan," "*by the side of* Jordan," and "*beyond* Jordan," and also Luke's tradition about "*people*." The place was not known in Origen's time and is not known in ours; but "*near* Jordan" is more probably correct than "*in* Jordan."

CHAPTER IV

"GOING UP FROM THE WATER"

§ 1 "Fire" or "Light" (**617—25**)

§ 2 Parallels or precedents (**626—8**)

§ 3 The Original may have mentioned "the going up of the Oblation" (**629**)

§ 4 Traditions resulting from this (**630—9**)

Summary. In the Answer from Heaven to Elijah's sacrifice, 1 K. xviii. 36 "*at the time of the evening oblation*" is omitted by Codex B and corrupted by Codex A into "at the *going up the water*." If the former were the original here, it would explain a large number of traditions, and, among them, "*The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world*."

CHAPTER V

THE RENDING OF THE HEAVENS

§ 1 "*Rending*," or "*opening*"? (**640—2**)

§ 2 Why omitted by several authorities? (**643—4**)

§ 3 Who saw the vision? (**645—52**)

§ 4 (Jn i. 51) "the heaven *set-open*" (**653—61**)

Summary. "*Rending*" was probably the earliest tradition but was altered to "*opening*" owing to the singularity of the former expression, and owing to Hebrew corruption. The difficulty of deciding between "*rending*" and "*opening*" led to the question "What was spiritually implied by this vision?"

John concluded that the "*rending*" was a rudimentary vision granted to the Baptist. He therefore omitted it here, as being implied in the descent of the Spirit, and also as being exaggerated by some Christians. But he inserted, a little later on, a statement of Jesus that the heaven would be *permanently* opened in the course of a continuous communication between heaven and earth.

CHAPTER VI

THE DESCENT OF THE SPIRIT

§ 1 What descended? (**662—76**)

§ 2 How? And with what result? The different traditions (**677—8**)

§ 3 "*Into*" Jesus, or "*on*" Him? (**679—84**)

Summary. The Original described the descent of "*the Spirit of the Lord*" as in Isaiah (xi. 2); but, owing to various interpretations of that passage, and discussions as to the "*spirits*" or "*spirit*" indicated thereby, the Synoptists used different terms. John preferred Mark's. There was early difference of opinion as to whether the Spirit came "*into*" Jesus or "*on*" Him. The choice of phrases would be influenced by notions of the "*dove*."

CHAPTER VII

THE DOVE

§ 1 The Dove in Jewish literature (**685—8**)

§ 2 The Dove in Gentile literature (**689—91**)

§ 3 Obstacles to the acceptance of the tradition of the Dove (**692—4**)

§ 4 "*Dove*" might be confused with "*resting*" (**695—6**)

§ 5 The "*Dove*" and Joseph's "*rod*," the legends (**697—702**).

§ 6 The "*Dove*" and Joseph's "*rod*," the legends explained (**703—10**)

§ 7 "*Resting*," how interpreted by Justin Martyr and Tertullian (**711—5**)

§ 8 Other circumstances that might favour the introduction of the Dove (**716—9**)

§ 9 Conclusion as to the Dove (**720—4**)

Summary. In Jewish literature, the Dove was the symbol of repentance, mourning, and timorousness : in Greek literature, it was the symbol of love and peace. Greeks were accustomed to symbolize the gods and their messengers as birds : Jews were not. Some narratives that omit "*dove*" add that the Spirit "*rested*" (or "*abode*") : some that insert "*dove*" omit "*rested*." The Hebrew for "*rested*" closely resembles that for "*dove*." The antiquity of some tradition about "*resting*" is proved by very early apocryphal writings connecting the "*resting*" of a "*dove*" with "*the rod of Jesse*"—taken as meaning the rod of Joseph, the descendant of Jesse and father of Jesus : but by the "dove" these apocryphal writers meant, not the Holy Spirit, but *Mary the wife of Joseph*. Justin and Tertullian explain "*resting*" as "*ceased*," i.e. *passed away from the Jews*.

The conclusion is that "*as a dove*," if part of the Original, *did not refer to visible shape, but meant "as a bird seeking its home."* More probably, however, "*dove" was not a part of the Original*, but was introduced, by error, as a Hebrew corruption for "*rested*." John, though not absolutely suppressing the tradition, excludes it from the message of God to the Baptist, so as to indicate that it was not an essential part of the foreordained sign by which the Baptist was to discern the Messiah.

BOOK II

BATH KOL

OR

VOICES FROM HEAVEN IN JEWISH TRADITION

CHAPTER I

BATH KOL BEFORE THE GOSPEL

§ 1 "Bath Kol," or "Voice from Heaven" (**725—6**)

§ 2 "The Voice of the Lord" in the Bible (**727—9**)

§ 3 John Hyrcanus and Hillel (**730—8**)

CHAPTER II

BATH KOL IN FAVOUR

§ 1 Bath Kol in the Targums of Jonathan ben Uzziel (**739—42**)

§ 2 Bath Kol in Siphra, Siphri, and Mishna (**743—6**)

§ 3 Bath Kol expressing (1) celestial decisions (**747—52**)

§ 4 Bath Kol expressing (2) celestial judgments (**753—5**)

§ 5 The Bath Kol for Hillel against Shammai (**756—62**)

CHAPTER III

BATH KOL ON ITS DEFENCE

§ 1 "One does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol" (**763—75**)

§ 2 Apologies for Bath Kol (**776—9**)

§ 3 Bath Kol as an echo (**780—5**)

Summary of Book II. The attitude of Jewish writers towards Bath Kol appears often to have been determined by doctrinal and personal considerations. The Jerusalem and the Babylonian Talmuds, where they happen to describe the same Voice from Heaven (which is seldom the case), sometimes take different views of it. But towards the end of the first century a protest was made against the application of Bath Kol to doctrinal questions, or to teachers discussing them. This protest found favour with many Jewish teachers, and may very naturally have influenced the Fourth Evangelist, both negatively, in omitting the Synoptic Voices, and positively, in inserting a Voice, of a different kind, peculiar to the Fourth Gospel.

BOOK III

VOICES FROM HEAVEN IN SYNOPTIC TRADITION

CHAPTER I

"BELOVED SON"

§ 1 Canonical traditions (**786—91**)

§ 2 Non-canonical traditions (**792—7**)

§ 3 Negative conclusion: the Synoptic tradition probably erroneous (**798—801**)

§ 4 "*Beloved*," in Matthew, a mistranslation of "*chosen*" in Isaiah (**802—4**)

§ 5 "*Son*," in the Synoptists, a mistranslation of "*servant*" in Isaiah (**805—11**)

§ 6 Evidence, apart from Isaiah, that the Messiah was once called "*Chosen*" (**812—4**)

§ 7 Disuse of "*Chosen*" as a name for the Messiah (**815—6**)

Summary. The early doubt as to the precise words of the Voice at the Baptism gave rise to various versions based on various texts of Scripture.

The evidence of Luke (ix. 35), in the account of the Voice at the Transfiguration, points to an original "*Chosen.*" John also, who says that the Baptist called himself a Voice, adds that the Baptist described Jesus, if we accept the Syro-Sinaitic reading, not as "*Son* of God," but as (i. 34) "*the chosen* of God." These and other facts indicate that the Synoptic Voice was based on Isaiah xlii. 1 ("my *Chosen*"). Owing to the similarity of the Hebrew for "*my Chosen*" and the Hebrew for "*in my beloved*," Matthew (xii. 18) has mistranslated "*Chosen*" as if it were "*Beloved.*" The context of Isaiah (xlii. 1 "my *Servant*...my *Chosen*") calls the Messiah "*Servant.*" This is rendered by the LXX "*boy*"—*meaning* "*Servant*," *but liable to be taken to mean* "*Son.*" The Synoptists have mostly taken it thus, converting Isaiah's "*Chosen*...*Servant*" into "*Beloved Son.*" This confusion was facilitated by the fact that the Hebrew "*my beloved*" literally means "*my only one*," but is specially applied to a "*son.*"

CHAPTER II

"HEAR YE HIM"

§ 1 The phrase introduces a "*Messenger*" in Exodus and a "*Prophet*" in Deuteronomy (**817—8**)

§ 2 Jewish traditions concerning the "*Messenger*" and the "*Prophet*" (**819—29**)

§ 3 Christian canonical traditions concerning the "*Messenger*" (**830—5**)

§ 4 Christian non-canonical traditions concerning the "*Messenger*" (**836—40**)

§ 5 Christian traditions concerning the "*Prophet*" (**841—7**)

§ 6 "Moses" and "Elijah" (**848—9**)

Summary. The words "*Hear ye him*" introduce a future Messenger or Angel in Exodus, and a future Prophet in Deuteronomy. Malachi, too, speaks of a

future Messenger, who is to prepare the way of the Lord : but this is in such ambiguous terms that some regarded the Messenger as Elijah, others as Messiah.

Early Jewish tradition varies as to the Messenger in Exodus, and interprets the prophet in Deuteronomy as being no particular prophet, but a prophet from time to time inspired with the spirit that inspired Moses.

Some early Christian traditions applied to Christ prophecies about the Messenger or Angel; but the application was not persevered in, probably as giving Him an inadequate title. The Deuteronomic prediction about the prophet was applied by the Acts of the Apostles to Christ in a distorted shape, and, through the Acts, by several Ante-Nicene Fathers, who distorted it still more.

The Synoptic Voice from Heaven, "*Hear ye him*," appears to have been part of a narrative describing how Christ was revealed to Peter and his companions as being both the Messenger in Exodus and the Prophet in Deuteronomy. Identifying the Messenger in Exodus with the Messenger in Malachi, *i.e.* Elijah, some early Christians may have believed that Christ was revealed to the disciples both as "the Prophets" (Elijah) and as "the Law" (Moses), and that "Hear ye him" meant "Hear ye him as Messenger and as Prophet." But others, improving on this, said that He was to be heard as the Son of God, including in Himself the Law and the Prophets, *i.e.* the glory of Moses and the glory of Elijah.

BOOK IV

THE SILENCE OF JOHN

CHAPTER I

THE VOICE AT THE BAPTISM
WHY OMITTED BY JOHN?

§ 1 The Baptist's mission as described by Luke (**850—3**)

§ 2 The Baptist's mission as described by John (**854—6**)

§ 3 The Original? The "*Refiner*"? (**857**)

§ 4 Ambiguities connected with the "*Refiner*" (**858—61**)

§ 5 "*Refiner*," perhaps, superseded by "*Chosen*" or "*Son*" (**862—4**)

Summary. The New Hebrew word for "*son*" is identical with forms of a Biblical word that might mean "*purified*," "*chosen*," which might be used to denote a Purifier, or Refiner, like the Messenger predicted by Malachi.

John omits the Synoptic Voice from Heaven at the Baptism ("*Beloved Son*"), 1st, because it did not come direct from Heaven, but indirectly through the Baptist, who described himself as a Voice and who received a message from Heaven; 2nd, because the Baptist's testimony did not include the word "*Son*." If the word mentioned by the Baptist was "the *Refiner*," it would naturally be converted into "the *Chosen One*," meaning the Messiah, and that again into "the *Son*."

CHAPTER II

THE VOICE AT THE TRANSFIGURATION
WHY OMITTED BY JOHN?

§ 1 A physical hypothesis, unsatisfactory (**865—8**)

§ 2 Origen's view: the Transfiguration subjective (**869—74**)

§ 3 Mark lends itself to the subjective hypothesis (**875—9**)

§ 4 St Paul favours the subjective hypothesis (**880—4**)

§ 5 Conflict of opinion as to Lk. ix. 33 "*Not knowing what he was saying*" (**885—90**)

§ 6 The "*three tabernacles*" (**891—5**)

§ 7 The Transfiguration compared with the Mosaic Theophany (Exod. xxxiii. 23) (**896—907**)

Summary. If the Transfiguration had actually occurred on an actual mountain, it might perhaps be explained, like the phenomenon witnessed on the hills of the Brocken and elsewhere, as being an apparition in which Peter, keeping watch between the two sons of Zebedee, about sun-rise, saw three figures, the central one with a halo round its head, shadowed on a cloud coming from the West. But that is not so probable as an explanation from linguistic error, which has changed a manifestation of spiritual glory into one of material splendour.

Mark's text shews signs of an original narrative in which the manifestation was of a subjective nature. St Paul, in his apparent allusion to the Transfiguration or Transformation, and in his precepts bidding the disciples to be "transfigured," favours a subjective hypothesis. Origen—who in this instance may guide us to historical as well as to spiritual truth—emphasizes the truth that Christ may be transfigured *for some, and not for others*, among a number of simultaneous spectators. Clement of Alexandria has remarks of the same tendency.

The solid basis of historical fact in the Synoptic narrative is Peter's ecstatic cry, "*Let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah.*" This could neither be invented, nor be created by accretion; for the Synoptists apologize as it were for it, and it caused scandal in very early times. Origen inveighs against Peter's utterance, as dividing things that should be undivided, and as coming from the devil. But the Synoptists imply elsewhere that Christ appeared to some Elijah, to others the prophet like Moses: and Peter, in a moment of inspiration, may have said, in effect, "Thou art, for us, Moses, the Law. Thou art, for us, Elijah, the Prophet. Thou art, for us,

thyself, the Priest, the Holy One of God, to whom point the Law and the Prophets. For Moses be the court of the people! For Elijah, the Holy Place! For thee, the Holy of Holies!"

But all this is lost or obscured in the extant Synoptic narratives—partly because they have taken "*He appeared* [*as*] *Moses and Elijah unto them*" as meaning "*There-appeared Moses and Elijah unto them*," which has led them into distracting details. But a greater obscuration consists in the stress laid on manifestations of physical splendour, such as "sun," "white," "light," "fuller," while there is scarcely an indication or suggestion (except in Luke) of the true glory—that of self-sacrifice. Hence the Synoptic Transfiguration, regarded as a manifestation of divine glory, is greatly inferior to the Mosaic Theophany in which, answering the Law-giver's petition, "Shew me thy *glory*," God replied "I will make all my GOODNESS pass before thee." For these reasons John rejected the whole of the narrative of the Transfiguration, as being not only historically false but also spiritually inadequate.

At the same time John accepted from the Synoptists this nucleus of fact, that at a crisis in Christ's life—in the moment when our Lord took upon Himself what the Jews call the Yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, and achieved that great act of self-renunciation or self-sacrifice, which was consummated on the Cross—there came a Bath Kol, or Voice from Heaven, which imparted a revelation *to a few, but only a few, of those present.* John also agreed with Luke in believing that this Bath Kol was preceded by prayer: but he felt that it was a defect in Luke's knowledge, or judgment, that he omitted to tell us the substance of the prayer. Consequently, the Fourth Evangelist, in reconstructing the narrative of this act—spiritually considered, the central act—of Christ's life, felt it right to attempt to represent in words the essence and spirit of Christ's prayer, and also to give the readers some conception of the nature of the "yoke" (called in the Western Church the "Cross") taken upon Himself by the Saviour in the moment when He laid the invisible foundations of the Spiritual Church.

BOOK V

THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN AN ANSWER TO PRAYER

CHAPTER I

"TROUBLE" PRECEDING PRAYER

§ 1 The object of investigation (**908—12**)

§ 2 The Johannine Voice from Heaven (**913—6**)

§ 3 "*Exceeding-sorrowful*," "*troubled*" (**917—24**)

§ 4 John's doctrine of "*trouble*", truer than that of the Synoptists (**925—8**); "taking up the cross" (**928** (i)—(x))

Summary. The exact words of the Bath Kol or Voice from Heaven are unimportant as compared with the motive and spirit of Christ's prayer. According to John, the "*soul*" of Jesus, before His prayer, was "*troubled*"—an expression taken from the same passage of the Psalter from which come the words of Christ given by Mark as uttered in Gethsemane, "My *soul* is *exceeding-sorrowful*."

But Mark, besides apparently mistranslating the words so as to exaggerate the depression suggested by them, leaves us under the impression that Christ feared death for His own sake, and Luke—perhaps thinking this erroneous—entirely omits the description of "*exceeding sorrow*." John steps in to emphasize the truth that Christ *did* feel sorrow, but *not such sorrow as might be inferred from Mark*.

Desiring, however, to correct—rather than contradict—the older Evangelists, John avoids the word "*sorrow*" and substitutes "*trouble*." This word enables him indirectly to contravene the doctrine of Epictetus, then in vogue, that a philosopher must retain, at all costs, "freedom from *trouble*." Christ, he implies, on the contrary, regarded Himself as sent to bear

"*trouble*." He "*troubled* Himself" for the mourners at the grave of Lazarus; He was "*troubled* in spirit" by the treachery of Judas; and here His "soul" was "*troubled*" at the sight of His Chosen People Israel, finally rejecting their Deliverer—in each case, "troubled" not for Himself but for men, His brethren; or perhaps rather for the whole Family of God, for the Name of the Father darkened by the fear of death, by blindness to truth, and by hatred of goodness.

CHAPTER II

CHRIST'S ONE PRAYER

§ 1 The Synoptic versions and their meanings (**929—32**)

§ 2 The Johannine version (**933—40**)

§ 3 Some Synoptic divergences, how explicable (**941—56**)

§ 4 The Epistle to the Hebrews, the interpolation in Luke, and the Acts of John (**957—64**)

§ 5 The first clauses of "The Lord's Prayer" (**965—71** (viii))

§ 6 John appears closer than the Synoptists to Christ's language about the "cup" (**972—9**)

Summary. (1) *Difficulties.* The strong phrase "*I will assuredly not* (οὐ μὴ) *do* [*this or that*]" occurs in the Synoptists only once, "*I will assuredly not drink*." John has precisely the same. But he refers it to the "cup" of suffering, and as equivalent to an affirmative, "I assuredly *will* drink": the Synoptists take it *negatively* as referring to "the fruit of the vine."

Mark and Luke, in the phrase "*remove* this cup," use a word that elsewhere, in connection with "cup," means "*present*," so that the meaning would naturally be "*present* this cup," but for the fact that they add "*from me*." John has "The cup that the Father hath *given* me."

Mark mentions a prayer that, if possible, "*the hour might pass away*." John has "*Why* [less prob. *What*] *should I say*, '*Father, save me from this hour*'?"

Mark and Matthew have phrases (*a*) about "if *possible*," "all things are *possible*," "not *possible*"; (*b*) about *repeating* prayers twice or thrice, and "*sitting*," "*departing*," "*coming again*" etc. All this is omitted by Luke and John.

(2) *Solutions.* (*a*) If "He prayed [saying] *thy* [or, *His*] *will be done*" was represented in Hebrew by "He prayed [saying] [be it] *according to thy* [or, *His*] *word*," the italicized words might be variously interpreted. Taking "*His* word" as *Christ's* word, an Evangelist might obtain the meaning, "He prayed according to *his* [*previous*] word," i.e. "*according to the* [*same*] *word* [*as before*]," i.e. repeating His prayer. Or, supplying "it is", he might obtain, "He prayed, [saying] [the matter is] *according to thy word*," i.e. "it is all in thy hands," "all things are *possible with thee*." (*b*) The Hebrew "*stand*" may mean "*be steadfast*," "*stand up*," or "*pray*": "*sit*" is frequently confused by the LXX with "*repeating*" an action.

John's extraordinary use of "*I will assuredly not*" indicates his conviction that *the fervid devotion of Christ's language had been completely misconstrued by the early Evangelists*, and suggests that he wished to retain the paradoxical expression, in order to shew how they had been misled. The omission, by Luke and John, of the Synoptic details about the repeated prayers, indicates that they arose from glosses and conflations.

The interpolation, in Luke, about "*an angel strengthening*" Jesus, and the statement in the Epistle to the Hebrews about His "*strong crying and tears*," seem to have arisen from the account of Jacob wrestling with the angel in Hosea xii. 3—4 (LXX) "*He had strength with the angel...they wept and entreated.*"

(3) *Conclusion.* Almost all these early variations shew a tendency either to materialize the burden of the Agony so that it might be intelligible to the most ordinary mind, or else to conform the narrative to prophecy. They give us the impression that Christ feared death and suffered agony for His own sake, and not for the sake of others.

But, having regard to the Jewish forms of prayer alleged to have been composed by Rabbis of the first

century, and also to the general tenor of Christ's utterances in all the Gospels, we may regard it as antecedently probable that Christ's one prayer, as recorded in the Synoptic Original, was an utterance, not of *passive* resignation, but of *active* acceptance. John may have known this to be the case and yet may not have known the exact words of the prayer. Amid a conflict of confusing traditions, he may have determined to select a version of the opening clause of what is commonly called the Lord's Prayer—"*Hallowed* be thy Name," or, more probably in the Original, "*Hallow* thy Name." But "*hallow*" was not so clear to the western churches as "*glorify*." The LXX, in Isaiah, renders "*hallowing* God" as "*glorifying* God": and, in the present instance, Hebrew variations may have favoured the substitution of the word "*glorify*". We conclude that both in the prayer "*glorify* thy Name," and in Christ's language about "*the cup*" that the Father had "*given*" Him, John approached—if not verbally at all events spiritually—closer than the Synoptists to our Lord's actual utterance.

CHAPTER III

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN

§ 1 The truth negatively (**980—2**)

§ 2 The truth positively (**983—9**)

§ 3 The truth as seen by John (**990—1000**)

§ 4 The truth as described by John: (i) the words (**1001—11**)

§ 5 The truth as described by John: (ii) the time (**1012—6**)

§ 6 The truth as described by John: (iii) the place (**1017—20**)

§ 7 The truth as it is (**1021—8**)

Summary. There was no one Voice, or definite number of Voices, that came from Heaven to Jesus. But Voices responsive to His prayers were constantly coming when He prayed under the burden of men's sufferings, and the still heavier burden of their passive and their active sins. Christ's bitterest sorrow appears

to have been for the treachery of Judas. Next to that cause, might be the blindness of "the wise and the prudent," and the restriction of the Gospel to "babes," revealed to Jesus in what might be called a Voice from Heaven to which He answered "Even so, Father, for so it hath seemed good in thy sight."

John found a multitude of books written, and still, in his days, being written, about the acts of Jesus; and he appears to have feared lest—by the accumulated traditions, largely legendary, about miracles, Voices from Heaven, Elijah, Moses, metamorphosis etc.—books might distract faith from the personality of the Son and from the Spirit of Sonship, emphasizing the "glory" of the flesh, and subordinating that "glory" of "grace and of truth" which is developed by trouble and prayer. He therefore desired to concentrate the truth about the Voices from Heaven into an account of one particular Voice in answer to one particular prayer following one particular trouble. At the same time he wished to follow the old traditions where he believed them to be correct, and even to reproduce them with verbal exactness wherever the reproduction might shew how they had been misunderstood by earlier Evangelists—if he could do this without obtrusively contradicting his predecessors.

Following the words of ancient exposition, perhaps apostolic, of Christ's single prayer, John represents Jesus as asking *how He could possibly pray to be delivered from the hour*, since He came for the very purpose of enduring that hour. As regards "*the cup*," he admits that the letter of Christ's utterance was "*I will assuredly not drink it*"; but he shews by the context that the meaning was that of a very strong affirmation, and that Christ expressed astonishment at the notion of not drinking the cup "*given*" to Him by the Father.

The occasion of Christ's prayer John represents as being the coming of the Greeks to Jesus, just before He finally "departed and was hidden from" the Jews; and probably the Temple is intended by him to be assumed as the place. In these details he may not be accurate, and perhaps does not aim at accuracy so much as at symbolism, since accuracy may have been

impossible. But there is abundant reason for thinking him right as to the spirit of Christ's prayer both at Gethsemane and elsewhere, when he gives it shape in the words "Father, glorify thy name"—an utterance inspired by the vital conviction that the greatest glory of a father is a good son, and the greatest glory of God is a good man.

APPENDIX I

NARRATIVES OF THE BAPTISM (*Greek and Latin*)

i. The Synoptists (**1029—31**); ii. John (**1032—3**); iii. Arabic Diatessaron, see **556**; iv. Justin Martyr (**1034—6**); v. Celsus (**1037—9**); vi. Testament of the XII Patriarchs (**1040—1**); vii. Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes (**1042**); viii. Ephrem Syrus (**1043—4**); ix. Gospel of the Ebionites (**1045**); x. Sibylline Oracles (**1046—8**); xi. Epiphanius (**1049—50**)

APPENDIX II

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE TRADITION "SUFFER IT TO BE SO NOW"

§ 1 "*Sabach*" (in Mk. xv. 34 "*Sabachthanei*") may mean "*suffer*" (**1051—6**)

§ 2 "*Heli*" might be taken by Evangelists as "*Elijah*," or "the *sun*"; "*sabach*" as "*forsake*" or "*be eclipsed*"; "*lama*" as "*why*," or "*to some extent*" (**1057—62**)

§ 3 Ramifications from "*sabach*" (**1063—7**)

§ 4 "*They know not what they do*" (**1068**)

§ 5 "*Elijah cometh*" (**1069**); Jewish legend (**1069** (i)—(v))

Summary. (1) Mark and Matthew, who say that Jesus, on the Cross, uttered the Aramaic word *Sabachthanei*, render it "*hast thou forsaken me.*" But the Biblical word for this is *Azaphthanei*; and this is substituted for *sabachthanei* by some of the best MSS. and versions in Mark. *Azaphthanei* is from *azab*,

which can mean nothing but "*forsake.*" *Sabachthanei* is from *sabach* (properly *sabak*), an ambiguous word: it *may mean* (i) "*forsake*," *but may also mean* (ii) "*let alone*," "*pass over*," "*pardon.*"

One Greek equivalent of *sabach* has *precisely the same ambiguity as the Aramaic.*

Hence arose *a multitude of traditions connecting our Lord's last words with* "*let alone*," "*permit*," "*suffer*," "*forgive.*" Mark and Matthew *combined* with some of these the old and true tradition about "*forsaking.*" But Luke and John *adopted the former instead of the latter*; and their justification was all the stronger because *sabach*, in the few instances in which it occurs in the Bible, *does not mean* "*forsake*," *but* means "*let alone.*"

(2) The Hebrew for "There *are* some that *say*" may be the same as for "There *were* some that *said.*" Hence a gloss (say A.D. 50) "There *are* some that *say*, He *called* for Elijah," might be incorporated in the Gospel (say A.D. 70) as "There *were* some [of the soldiers] that *said*, 'He *calleth* for Elijah'": and this, when combined with variations of "*let* [*ye me*] *alone*," "*let* [*thou him*] *alone*," might originate in Mark the soldiers' dialogue, justly omitted by Luke and John.

(3) The interpolation in Luke, "*Father, forgive*," is a misunderstanding of "*Heli, forsake*," *Heli*, i.e. "*God*," being paraphrased as "*Father.*"

(4) The tradition that Jesus said to *Heli*, or *Elijah*, "*let alone*," or "*suffer*," gave rise to a far-fetched suggestion that He must have said this to *John the Baptist*, of whom Jesus had said (Mk xi. 14) "This is *Elijah.*" But the only Synoptic occasion on which Jesus and the Baptist were together was the Baptism of Christ. Hence sprang the legend (only to be found in Matthew) that Jesus said to the Baptist—in answer to the latter, who deprecated the proposal that he should baptize the Lord—"*Suffer it to be so now.*"

(5) A similar explanation applies to (Lk. xxii. 51) "*Suffer ye* thus far," (Jn. xviii. 8) "*Suffer ye* these to depart," and to Luke's tradition about a "*failing*," or "*eclipse*," of the "*sun*" (*Heli* being taken for "*sun*," and *sabach* for "*fail*" or "be *eclipsed*").

APPENDIX III

THE TRANSFIGURATION AND THE AGONY

CANONICAL AND NON-CANONICAL ACCOUNTS

(*Greek*)

§ 1 The Transfiguration according to the Synoptists (text as in W.H.) (**1070**)

§ 2 The Agony according to the Synoptists (text as in W.H.) (**1071**)

§ 3 The corresponding accounts in the Acts of John (ed. James) (**1072—4**)

§ 4 The Transfiguration in the Revelation of Peter (ed. James) (**1075**)

APPENDIX IV

BATH KOL IN TARGUMS AND TALMUDS

(*A reprint of Pinner's collection in the Introduction to B. Berachoth,* 1842)

§ 1 Instances from the Targums of Jonathan ben Usiël (**1076—7**)

§ 2 Instances from Siphra (**1078**)

§ 3 „ „ Siphri (**1079**)

§ 4 „ „ Mischnah (**1080—1**)

§ 5 „ „ Jerusalem Talmud (**1082—91**)

§ 6 „ „ Babylonian Talmud (**1092—1109**)

§ 7 "Erklärungen" (**1110—5**)

APPENDIX V

"THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST PETER"

CONTRASTED WITH

"THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN"

§ 1 The one point of similarity—the claim of both to have "seen" or "heard" (**1116—8**)

§ 2 Yet the Evangelist is a true Prophet (**1119—20**)

§ 3 The Letter-writer has no prophecy of his own (**1121—2**)

§ 4 He has no style of his own (**1123—5**)

§ 5 He writes artificially and grandiloquently (**1126—7**)

§ 6 Some of his mistakes like those of Baboo English (**1128—9**)

§ 7 His resemblance to the Pseudo-Peter of the Petrine Apocalypse (**1130**)

§ 8 His version of the Voice at the Transfiguration (**1131**)

§ 9 His reiterations (**1132**)

§ 10 His mention of "all the Epistles" of "our beloved brother Paul" (**1133—4**)

§ 11 Not an "imitator" of Josephus, but perhaps a pilferer from him (**1135**)

APPENDIX VI

THE PROMISE OF EUSEBIUS (**1136—1149**)

INDICES.

I. Of New Testament Passages

II. Of Subject-matter (English and Greek)

III. Of Subject-matter (Hebrew)

REFERENCES

(i) *Black Arabic numbers*, e.g. (**275**), refer to subsections indicated in this volume or in the preceding ones entitled, severally, *Clue* and *Corrections*: subsections **1**—**272** belong to *Clue*, **273**—**552** to *Corrections*: (**275***a*) means a footnote on subsection **275**.

(ii) The Books of Scripture are referred to by the ordinary abbreviations, except where specified below. But when it is said that Samuel, Isaiah, Matthew, or any other writer, wrote this or that, it is to be understood as meaning *the writer, whoever he may be, of the words in question*, and not as meaning that the actual writer was Samuel, Isaiah, or Matthew.

(iii) The MSS. known severally as the Alexandrian, the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Codex Bezae, are called by their usual abbreviations A, ℵ, B, and D. The Syriac version of the Gospels discovered by Mrs Gibson on Mount Sinai is called in the text the "Syro-Sinaitic" or "Sinaitic Syrian," and in the notes is referred to as SS.

(iv) The text of the Greek Old Testament adopted is that of Professor Swete[1]; of the New, that of Westcott and Hort.

(v) Modern works are referred to by the name of the work, or author, the vol., and the page, e.g. Levy iii. 343 *a*, i.e. column 1, page 343, vol. iii.

ABBREVIATIONS

A and ℵ, see (iii) above.

B, see (iii) above.

B., before a Talmudic tractate, means *Babylonian* (as distinguished from J. = Jerusalem), e.g. B. Berach. = the Berachoth in the *Babylonian* Talmud, to which references are mostly made by *leaves*, e.g. 61 *b*, i.e. the second side of leaf 61.

Buhl = Buhl's edition of Gesenius, Leipzig, 1899.

Chr. = *Chronicles*.

Clem. Alex. 42 = Clement of Alexandria in Potter's pages.

D, see (iii) above.

Dalman *Words* = *Words of Jesus*, Eng. Transl. 1902.

[1] This differs greatly from that of most earlier editions, which are usually based on Codex A (*Clue* **33**).

Diatess. = the Arabic Diatessaron, sometimes called Tatian's, translated by Rev. H. W. Hogg, B.D., in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

Ency. = *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

Ephrem = Ephraemus Syrus, ed. Moesinger.

Esdras, the First Book of, is frequently called, in the text, Esdras.

Etheridge = *Targums on the Pentateuch*, London, Longman, 1862—5.

Euseb. = (unless otherwise indicated) the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.

Gesen. = the edition of Gesenius now being published by the Oxford University Press.

Hamburger = Hamburger's *Encyclopaedia.*

Hawkins = Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*, Oxford, 1899.

Heb. LXX = that part of the LXX of which there is an extant Hebrew Original.

Hershon, Genes. Rab. = Hershon's Rabbinical commentary on Genesis, London, 1885.

Hershon, Genes. Talm. = Hershon's Talmudical commentary on Genesis, London, 1883.

Hor. Heb. = *Horae Hebraicae*, by John Lightfoot, 1658—74, ed. Gandell, Oxf. 1859.

Iren. = the treatise of Irenaeus against Heresies.

J., before a Talmudic tractate, means *Jerusalem* (as distinguished from B. = Babylonian), e.g. J. Berach. = the Berachoth in the *Jerusalem* Talmud, to which references are mostly made by chapters and sections, e.g. iii. 2.

Jer. Targ. I and II = the Targums of "Jonathan Ben Uzziel" and the fragments of the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch.

K. = *Kings.*

leg. = (as in Tromm.) "legerunt," i.e. the LXX "read" so-and-so instead of the present Hebrew text.

Levy = Levy's *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1889; Levy Ch. = *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., 1881.

L.S. = Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

Onk. = the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch.

Original, for the meaning of, see p. xxxvi (*c*).

Oxf. Conc. = *The Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint.*

Philo is referred to by Mangey's volume and page, e.g. Philo ii. 234.

Resch = Resch's *Paralleltexte* (4 vols.), except where the *Agrapha*, or *Logia Jesu*, are expressly mentioned.

S. = *Samuel.*

Schöttg. = Schöttgen's *Horae Hebraicae*, Dresden and Leipzig, 1733.

Sir. = the work of Ben Sira, *i.e.* the son of Sira. It is commonly called Ecclesiasticus (see **20***a*). The original Hebrew has been edited, in part, by Cowley and Neubauer, Oxf. 1897; in part, by Schechter and Taylor, Camb. 1899.

SS, see (iii) above.
Talmud, see B. Berach. and J. Berach. above.
Tisch. = Tischendorf's New Testament.
Tromm. = Trommius' *Concordance to the Septuagint.*
Tryph. = the Dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew.
Wetst. = Wetstein's *Comm. on the New Testament*, Amsterdam, 1751.
W.H. = Westcott and Hort's New Testament.

(*a*) A bracketed Arabic number, following the sign =, and connecting a Hebrew and a Greek word, indicates the number of instances in which that Hebrew word is represented by that Greek word in the LXX—e.g. חרם = *ἀναθεματίζω* (13), *ἐξολοθρεύω* (23), *ἀπόλλυμι* (2).

(*b*) Where verses in Hebrew, Greek, and Revised Version, are numbered differently, the number of R. V. is given alone.

(*c*) "Original"—in such a phrase as "Mark's *Original* may have had this or that"—does not mean an "Ur-Marcus", or any definite document, but the original tradition, written or oral, Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, that Mark may have had before him when writing the particular words in question. Each Evangelist may have stamped the materials before him with his own style. But this book leaves it an open question what those materials generally were. It merely shews that, in this or that particular passage, a discrepancy between Evangelists (*e.g.* if one wrote "*delivering-up*" but another "*perfecting*") might be explained by the existence of an Original (*e.g.* שלם, which in Aramaic might mean "*deliver-up*" but in Hebrew "*perfect*") taken by them, or by the authorities from whom they borrowed, in these two senses. Comp. *Clue* (Introd. xvii. n.) "It is quite possible that in the written Hebrew Gospel, Aramaic words were included...and even Aramaic passages."

By "Original", then, is meant, as a rule, *relatively* (not *absolutely*) original—the immediate origin of the passage under consideration. Such an Original may itself have been derived from a more ancient origin.

INTRODUCTION I

ON THE HONESTY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

APART from other subordinate objects, enumerated in a subsequent Introduction of a more personal nature, the aim of this work is to demonstrate the honesty, and the historical as well as the spiritual worth, of what is commonly called "The Gospel according to St John." Evidence prevents me from believing that it was written by the son of Zebedee or by any eye-witness of the acts of our Lord, and forces me to suspect or deny the literal accuracy of some of its statements; but I most earnestly desire to help unlearned as well as perhaps some learned readers to discern the impassable gulf that separates this sublime production from a merely false and ignoble forgery like the so-called "Second Epistle of St Peter[1]."

Nearly five and twenty years ago, while writing an article on "Gospels" for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and circulating the proof-sheets among friends, availing myself of criticism from any quarter that promised frankness, ability, spiritual insight, and critical knowledge, I trespassed upon the leisure of one of the most able journalists and essayists of the last century, with whom, though my personal acquaintance did not extend beyond a single conversation of a quarter of an

[1] See Appendix V.

hour, I had the privilege of an occasional epistolary correspondence. His reply, after reading and often re-reading, I have recently mislaid or destroyed; but I am certain of its substance and almost certain of two of its key-words. In effect, it pronounced the Fourth Gospel worthless unless written by an eye-witness: in detail, it contained (I think) the word "forgery" and (I am almost sure) the epithet "impudent".

My correspondent was then what would perhaps be called a Broad Churchman, certainly an admirer of F. D. Maurice; and his articles on theological subjects—combining reverence and spiritual insight with intellectual force, literary culture, and a natural nobility of thought and style—were a refreshment week by week to thousands of educated readers. If such a man could express himself in such terms about the Fourth Gospel, on the hypothesis of its proceeding from one who was not an eye-witness of the facts, the conclusion was inevitable that, in the existing state of knowledge among the professional classes in England, the Fourth Gospel must remain either the work of the son of Zebedee, or worse than worthless, not indeed quite so contemptible in respect of style as "The Second Epistle of St Peter," but still morally as bad, or even worse, because better adapted to deceive.

And yet the conviction remained within me that this criticism was completely erroneous. But it was impossible at that time to demonstrate its error. I had not a sufficient mastery of the historical or textual facts. It is true that I dimly discerned some of the difficulties that must have beset an honest Evangelist at the beginning of the second century attempting to convey the real and spiritual truth without shaking the faith of Christians in the equally honest but not equally spiritual attempts of a multitude of earlier Evangelists —one or two perhaps so early that they were beginning to be regarded as "Scripture"; but the difficulties needed to be not only more clearly discerned by me but also more amply

illustrated, before I could hope to make them apparent to others. It was necessary to proceed from the known to the unknown. In the New Testament, parallel passages of the Gospels had to be more closely examined and their differences traced to their several causes. The canonical texts had to be compared with corrupt versions of them, and with later non-canonical traditions bearing on them. In the Old Testament, the distortions of the Hebrew by the Greek translators, together with their occasional omissions and far more frequent insertions; in later Hebrew, the evidence from the Talmuds and the Targums and other Jewish literature, shewing how Christian Jews might think and helping one to realise how Christian Greeks might represent, or misrepresent, their thoughts; in the Dark or Middle Ages, the rapid developments of legendary or non-historical tradition, as for example, in the accounts of the miracles of St Thomas of Canterbury—all these were facts that might have a bearing upon the subject to be elucidated; but with some of them I had then but a superficial acquaintance, and with others none at all.

Since that time, twenty-five years of study, while deepening my previous negative convictions as to the evidential qualifications of the Fourth Evangelist, also convinced me that I had occasionally underestimated his anxiety to be historically as well as spiritually truthful. Where I had once supposed him to be inventing or (if I may coin a useful barbarism) poeticizing, he now appeared to be extracting the spiritual truth out of some ancient tradition obscured by Mark and omitted or variously interpreted by the later Evangelists. For indeed by such obscurities, omissions, and variations, a lover of Christ and of Christ's truth and of Christ's flock—especially the "lambs" or "little children"—writing a Gospel at the beginning of the second century, might well feel grievously perplexed. What was he to do? Was he to adhere to the Synoptic tradition, correcting it as well as he could? Had he done this—even supposing that he had felt fairly

confident of the precise words of the original—he would have added one more Gospel to be criticized, compared, and harmonized. But his object was to write a Gospel that should have quite different results, one that should lift his readers out of the critical atmosphere into the region of adoring love. Besides, it may be taken as certain that in most of such cases he did *not* feel sure of *the real words*. What, however, he *did* feel sure of was *the real spirit*, which had passed into him from the Lord Jesus—by what precise personal or impersonal channel, or channels, we do not know—enabling him to represent our Lord, not as He appeared in the flesh to the multitudes, or even to the disciples in Galilee, but as He appeared to those who loved Him when they, after His death—looking back upon His past and forward to His future, and feeling His present influence burning within them—summed up the character and person of their Saviour in one consistent image, and realized Him as the Holy One of God, their only Light and Life.

"But how"—it may be asked—"explain or justify (in one who loved and revered Christ) the long discourses attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, so absolutely different from anything attributed to Him in the Three? Might not the author have at least kept as far as possible to the ancient traditions of Christ's words—explaining, paraphrasing, yes, even amplifying, but not substituting long discourses of his own in words of his own (for his own they undoubtedly are)?" The answer is probably to be found, partly in the author's desire to break with the past and introduce a tradition absolutely new in shape though old in essence; partly in his objection to anything that involved invidious comparison with the older Gospels. But partly, and principally, it may be as follows:—"The discourses originated in explanations (perhaps proceeding from John the son of Zebedee) intended by the originator to explain what Christ *meant*, and to be as it were a marginal or parenthetical commentary on the text, not part of the text

itself. But subsequently, being modified and amplified by the evangelists and elders of the Ephesian Church, and being thrown into the form of a consecutive, harmonious, and artistic whole by one particular Evangelist (perhaps John the Elder), the whole mass of explanation or comment came to be regarded not merely as what Christ *meant* but as what He actually *said*."

It was a custom of the later Jews to paraphrase the Scriptures in Targums, and to amplify them in what they called Haggada, often for mere picturesqueness, but sometimes in the attempt to bring out their historical[1] or spiritual meaning. For example, in the sacrifice of Isaac, the Bible simply says that Abraham "bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar upon the wood, and stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son," leaving the reader to supply the willingness of the son to be sacrificed by his father. But the Jerusalem Targum adds, "And Izhak answered and said to his father, Bind me aright lest I tremble from the affliction of my soul, and be cast into the pit of destruction, and there be found profaneness in thy offering." Now it happens that, in Hebrew, if a Targumist had wished to say, "Isaac *felt* this or that, when he lay on the altar," or "Isaac *said* this or that *to himself* (or, *in his heart*)," or "Isaac *meant* this or that," a common Biblical way of expressing this would be, "Isaac *said* it"—*omitting* "*to himself*" *or* "*in his heart*". Hence the transition must have been easy in Jewish tradition from Jewish Targums about what "Jesus *meant*" to Greek

[1] "Historical." Comp. Megill. 3*a*; concerning Zech. xii. 11 "In that day there shall be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon," R. Joseph said, "Without the Targum I should not have understood that verse, [the Targum is] *In that day there shall be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning for Ahab the son of Omri, whom Hadadrimmon the son of Tabrimmon slew in Ramoth Gilead, and as the mourning for Josiah the son of Amon, whom Pharaoh the Lame slew in the plain of Megiddo.*"

traditions about what "Jesus *said*[1]". This, in the course of many years of oral teaching, in which Jewish apostolic tradition was filtered through Greek thought and Alexandrian symbolism, may help to explain the origin of the long Johannine dialogues and discourses the nucleus of which—so the present writer believes—is closer than most Synoptic tradition to the deeper doctrines of Christ.

But further, our Apostle was something more than a Targumist. According to Luke, the Apostles had not only seen the Lord Jesus after death, but had received instruction from Him for "forty days". The number is probably typical, and the actual period of post-resurrection communication by voice between the Lord and the Twelve continued long after that time, sometimes in special visions accompanied by special voices (such as "Arise, Peter, kill and eat," and "What God hath cleansed call not thou common"); but sometimes also in more general utterances illuminating the parables or dark sayings of the Lord in Galilee, or the meaning of His later words and acts, and especially the Lord's Supper and the Passion. St Paul was not one of the Twelve. Yet he had heard the voice of the risen Saviour, not only at his conversion, but long afterwards in Corinth, and presumably on other occasions when he had been snatched up into the third heaven, "whether in the body I know not," he says, "or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth." So little stress did this thirteenth Apostle lay on such a knowledge of the actual words of Christ as he might have obtained from the Twelve, that he goes straight from Ananias his baptizer not to Jerusalem but to Arabia[2], there to be alone with the Spirit of Christ. And it was *from Christ, direct, that St Paul asserts himself to have "received" the words of Institution of the Eucharist:* "I *received* from the

[1] For "say"="say in one's heart," see Gesen. 56 *a*; and for a specimen of the application of this theory to the Fourth Gospel, see **1003—12.**

[2] Gal. i. 17.

Lord that which also I delivered unto you[1]." According to the Jews, *all their teaching was "delivered" and "received"*. The original source was God, but there were channels, thus: Moses *received* the Torah from Sinai and *delivered* it to Joshua, who *delivered* it to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets *delivered* it to the men of the Great Synagogue, among whom was Simon the Just; Antigonus *received* from Simon, and so on[2]. Hence no Jew could miss the meaning of St Paul's words; he did *not* "receive" from the Twelve, he "received" from *the Lord* by revelation the words of the Institution, including the saying—not found in any Gospel except an amplified or interpolated Luke—"Do this in remembrance of me." Yet Christians, while admitting that Christ did not actually "say" these words, may feel sure that He "*said*" *them in the Hebrew sense*, i.e. *He "meant" them*, and may accept St Paul's tradition as inspired in the highest sense, as a comment in which the Holy Spirit, speaking through the Apostle of the Gentiles, filled up the deficiency of the language of the East so as to make it intelligible and living for the West.

But if St Paul, an Apostle "born out of due time," who was "not worthy to be called an Apostle," who had never seen or heard Christ in the flesh, and who had once persecuted His Church, could thus teach in Corinth, and establish in Christendom, words that were only "*meant*", not "*said*", by the Lord Jesus, how much more might one of the pillar Apostles[3], John the son of Zebedee, "the beloved disciple", venture to tell the Church in Ephesus that Jesus "*said*" this or that, which in fact He did not "*say*" in articulate words, but did "*say*" in the Spirit!

These remarks are intended to prepare the reader to meet the accusation that the Evangelist says that he "saw" what—

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23. [2] Aboth i. 1—3.
[3] Gal. ii. 9, and see below **943**.

not being (according to our present hypothesis) an eye-witness—he could not "see". Take for example the words, "And straightway there came out blood and water [from Jesus on the cross]. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he saith true," compared with the conclusion of the Gospel: "This [*i.e.* almost certainly, John the son of Zebedee] is the disciple that *beareth witness of these things* and *wrote* these things: and we know that his witness is true[1]." There are many obstacles to the acceptance of this assertion ("hath *seen* [the flow of blood and water]") as literally true; and, if it is not so, some may be disposed to think that the above-quoted condemnation of "impudent forgery" is hardly too severe to apply to it.

But imagine John the son of Zebedee in his old age, long after his return from Patmos to Ephesus, once more (as when he wrote the Apocalypse) "in the Spirit on the Lord's day[2]," and receiving a revelation as to that mysterious Cross which was to the Greeks foolishness and to the Jews a stumbling-block. He may have been sitting with his Elders or Bishops around him, while they were hotly discussing their controversies with some keen Stoic, or obstinate Rabbi of an Ephesian synagogue, as to the nature of purification and the comparative efficacy of baptism and of sprinkling with blood: and they may have attributed their Bishop's apparent indifference to the lethargy of age. Yet he is not indifferent, but absent. His body is in Ephesus, but his mind on Golgotha. In a flash his eyes have been opened, and he is seeing, not water alone nor blood alone, but a mingled stream of blood and water together flowing from the heart of his Lord upon the Cross, the "fountain against sin and uncleanness" predicted by Zechariah[3], not cleansing

[1] Jn xix. 35, xxi. 24. [2] Rev. i. 10.
[3] Zech. xiii. 1.

the bodies but pouring a pure life into the souls of sinners. This he would say he "saw", and so he did see it—as clearly as any of the numerous visions that he "saw" at Patmos. In after years, the Elders of Ephesus, handing on his Gospel, would attest his revelation as a whole, and declare that they knew his witness to be true. But they would also take special pains to deliver this particular testimony of the beloved disciple concerning the vision of the Cross, as far as possible in his own words—asseverating his conviction of its truth, as though he were still living among them—"I saw it and I know that my witness is true." Last of all would come our Evangelist, who—with the freedom of a true prophet—would develop, explain, and amplify the nucleus of truth bequeathed to his predecessors the Elders of Ephesus, by their first Bishop. Thus he would give to the rough Hebrew original a Greek literary unity and an artistic harmony, and yet—with the insight of a true prophet—would perceive that "the beloved disciple" was the real originator and author, he himself being, in comparison, nothing but the instrument. "Spiritually speaking", he would say, "John the Disciple of the Lord wrote, the Elders attested, I myself was but the pen." In thus executing his labour of love, while embodying in his written Gospel this most beautiful vision, he might unfortunately lead later ages to suppose, and perhaps might himself suppose, that it was literally and materially true. This conjecture is offered here for the present only as a conjecture, but as a fairly probable one, to be supported hereafter in a separate commentary on the Fourth Gospel by cumulative evidence, but meantime to be accepted provisionally in arrest of a hasty verdict that "the Fourth Gospel is either literally true" or else "an impudent forgery[1]".

[1] Compare the following vision of George Fox, as to which we may feel confident that the seer had not the slightest intention of borrowing

On the first page of this volume—hoping to stimulate readers to reflect on the difficulties besetting the path of this (as it seemed to me) misunderstood Evangelist—I ventured to call his Gospel an "attempt at *indirect biography where direct biography was impossible.*" I meant "impossible" both materially and spiritually. The former impossibility would arise from want of trustworthy matter, letters, reports, books, and the like: and in this connection it need only be added that the most ancient of our ecclesiastical historians reveals a quite Johannine dissatisfaction with "*books*[1]" and a longing for traditions about *persons* who might pass on to him some echo of the "*living and abiding voice.*" But, even if short-hand reporters, eye-witnesses, had accurately written down Christ's each word and act, a second kind of impossibility would still have existed (I believe) for our Evangelist, arising from the nature of personality in general and of this Person in particular. No artist, not even Turner, can paint the sun. The Synoptists tried to express the splendour of the transfigured Lord in language about "light", "whiten", "snow", "lightning", "no fuller on earth", &c. Our author felt that he could not, no, even "the beloved disciple" could not, delineate in any words, much less in these, the glory of the Only Begotten in its fulness of grace and truth[2].

---

from the Fourth Gospel, and that he "saw" what he says he "saw" (Fox's *Journal*, p. 14):

"Soon after, there was another great meeting of professors; and a captain named Amor (*sic*) Stoddard came in. They were discoursing of the blood of Christ. As they were discoursing of it, *I saw, through the immediate opening of the invisible Spirit, the blood of Christ;* and cried out among them, saying '*Do ye not see the blood of Christ?* See it in your hearts, to sprinkle your hearts and consciences from dead works, to serve the living God.' *For I saw the blood of the new covenant, how it came into the heart.*"

[1] For Papias see **995—6**; for the Johannine feeling about books see **999**.

[2] Jn i. 14.

But "*direct biography*" is perhaps an obscure expression. In the original form of the Dedication it was explained by words that then followed but were subsequently cancelled as inappropriate for their position. After the cancelling, the expression was still retained as being brief, easily remembered, and possibly provocative of thought. Perhaps the discarded portion of the Dedication, a little modified and amplified, may not seem too lengthy to come here as a summary of this Introduction, and also as suggesting an explanation of what some have called the egotistic element in the Evangelist's conception of Christ. I have bracketed the words deleted.

"To the unknown author of the Fourth Gospel, the noblest attempt at indirect biography where direct biography was impossible; [*who, finding the glory of the Lord Jesus so darkened by legendary materialism and misinterpretation that historic detail was no longer discernible, was inspired by the Holy Spirit not to correct old writings but to write things new in letter yet old in essence, not contradicting nor arguing but explaining, so as to reveal his Master indirectly (as seen in the mirror of "the disciple whom He loved")—a Being human and divine, at once the Humblest and the Highest, Lord of Lords because Servant of Servants, claiming our allegiance not for His separate self but for the Spirit of the Son within Him, which Spirit if any man has felt, he has felt the Father in heaven*]."

INTRODUCTION II

ON THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK

THE Preface to Part I of Diatessarica, giving a programme of the whole series, described Part III as intended to be a commentary on Mark. An explanation of the reasons for deviating from that programme will enable the reader to understand the origin, nature, and objects, of the present volume.

Re-studying Mark's text I was led to the conclusion that almost all the names peculiar to his Gospel—such as Abiathar, Alexander, Rufus, Bartimaeus, Boanerges, Dalmanutha, Salome, and Timaeus—were erroneous and consequently omitted by subsequent Evangelists. Further examination shewed that similar suspicion attached itself to some names in the later Gospels. Sometimes the spuriousness of one name, *e.g.* Dalmanutha, suggested the spuriousness of another, *e.g.* Magada (or Magdala), and the two had to be discussed together. Finally, it appeared that the subject must be treated as a whole, before I could proceed with my commentary. So I turned aside to "Gospel Names".

This new task having been almost completed, I found myself brought to a stand at the name "Galilee" because of its insertion, omission, or varying context, in parallel passages of the profoundest interest where our Lord predicted His Passion and Resurrection. Examining these predictions

anew, and the remarkable deviations of Luke from the two earlier Gospels, and the absolutely new vocabulary in which John described the Saviour as predicting His death, I was led to take up in particular the prophecy that the Lord would be "delivered up", or "betrayed". Comparing Isaiah's saying that the Messiah would "*make intercession*"[1] with the LXX's version that He would "be *delivered up*", I came to the conclusion that Mark had led the Synoptists into a rendering that subordinated, if it did not altogether conceal, our Lord's sense of the "intercessory" nature of His death, and that this error had extended even to our English translation of St Paul's Epistles, and, through them, to that portion of our Communion Service which speaks of "the same night on which he was *betrayed*," whereas it should have been "*delivered up* [by the Father for the sins of men][2]." The importance of this error, and of ramifications from it, led to a second digression on "Christ's Predictions of His Resurrection."

But again, the study of our Lord's sayings on the night before the Crucifixion (concerning His being "delivered up", and "he that delivereth me up is at hand") led me to reflect on the extraordinary want of agreement between the Evangelists as to His very last utterance just before He was abandoned by the Twelve. At first, this disagreement seemed explicable as the result of the momentary consternation of His disciples. If so, it occurred to me that closer agreement might be hoped for as to His first words when He entered on public life. Yet here, Luke entirely deviates from Mark and Matthew[3], and John describes things from quite a different point of view. Perplexed by these variations as to Christ's first public words, I turned to the consideration of Christ's first public appearance, the striking event described by John as well as by the Synoptists—the Baptism of Christ and the

[1] Is. liii. 12. [2] See below **927—8.**

[3] Mk i. 15, Mt. iv. 17, Lk. iv. 15, Jn i. 38.

descent of the Spirit. Here, if anywhere, I might hope to find, not indeed identity or even similarity of words, but at all events substantial unanimity.

The attempt first to find it, and then to explain thoroughly why it could not be found, originated a third and last digression, which was originally intended to include merely the Baptism of Christ and the Voice from Heaven. Indeed at first sight it appeared that there was no room for a treatise but only for a string of disappointing antitheses, such as these: (1) The Synoptists mention a Voice from Heaven, John does not; (2) John mentions a message from God to the Baptist, the Synoptists do not; (3) John says that the Spirit was to "remain" on Jesus, the Synoptists do not; (4) John says that the Baptist saw the descent of the Spirit, the Synoptists do not (but either state the descent as a fact or leave it doubtful who saw it), &c. But further examination shewed that more results might be expected if more labour were expended.

In the first place, besides a remarkable number of variations in canonical documents, there were non-canonical accounts of, or allusions to, the Baptism: and these might throw light on the subject if they were placed, clause by clause, beside their several canonical parallels. In the next place, there were other passages in the Gospels themselves that had a direct bearing on the problem.

To take the Gospel passages first. I was dealing with a stupendous Synoptic miracle, a Voice from Heaven, and with the question why John omitted it. How could I hope to answer that, if I lazily neglected the fact that the Synoptists mention another Voice from Heaven (in the Transfiguration) and that John omits that too? Could it be that John did not believe in Voices from Heaven? This led to a new question, namely, whether the Jews had anything to say on this point. I soon found—as the reader will find too—that they had a great deal to say, and that towards the end of the first century

they became so tired of Voices from Heaven that one of their Rabbis said, "*We do not trouble ourselves about them.*" Was John, I asked, of that opinion? No, he could not be. For he himself recorded a Voice from Heaven. But this added perplexity to perplexities, for—marvellous to relate—I found the Synoptists, who obviously had no objection to Voices from Heaven, omitting the Johannine Voice! Were Voices from Heaven, then, so common in Christ's life that the Evangelists, like the Rabbi, "did not trouble themselves" to record all of them? Moreover, in the two Voices that the Synoptists did insert, how came it to pass that they did not agree as to the exact words, and that a well-supported text of Luke gave an entirely different version of the Voice at the Baptism?

Still keeping to the Canonical Gospels, I had to answer other questions. Luke in his account of the Voices, twice mentions Christ's praying as a preliminary to the Voice, but gives no prayer[1]; John gives a prayer, and makes the Voice a kind of reduplicated echo of it[2]. Again, John's prayer, in its context, suggested a reference to the prayer at Gethsemane, *the only prayer of Christ recorded by the three Synoptists.* But why was the Synoptic version (as commonly accepted) so different from the Johannine version of the single short appeal ("Glorify thy name") uttered by the Son to the Father in heaven? And whence came the curious differences between Mark and the two later Synoptists in recording the Prayer?[3] This led to a comparison of the Synoptic accounts of the Agony and to further questions. Why does Luke omit all mention of the *three* drowsy disciples watching with Jesus, and the three prayers? And why is John's account different both from Luke's and from that of Mark and Matthew?

Luke indeed introduces the three drowsy disciples on another occasion when Christ prays, not, however, on or near

[1] Lk. iii. 21, ix. 28.

[2] Jn xii. 27—8, "*Glorify*...I have both *glorified* and will *glorify*."

[3] See below 929 foll.

the Mount of Olives, but on the Mount of Transfiguration. Now this was called by the early Church mount Tabor; modern critics prefer Hermon; the *Acts of John* calls it "the mountain where it was His custom to pray," and the Second Epistle of Peter "the holy mount". Was it indeed "the Holy Mountain" of God, called by the later Jews "the Mountain of the Lord's House," and did it mean, either literally or spiritually, the Temple?[1] If so, was the Transfiguration a vision seen in the Temple (like the vision of Isaiah and the trance of St Paul[2]) and did that explain John's omission of the whole event (surely a central and stupendous event, if true, in the life of Christ)? But how explain the Synoptic introduction of Elijah and Moses? Must one be driven to a materialistic explanation—like that of the Brocken phantoms—in which the three disciples saw themselves as three figures?[3] or could this feature be explained by a corruption of an original tradition that "He (*i.e.* Jesus) appeared to them [as] Moses and Elijah," when taken as meaning "There appeared to them Moses and Elijah[4]"? This necessitated an examination of the Transfiguration narrative and of the very remarkable illustrations of it derivable from the *Acts of John* (which omits Elijah and Moses, and places the story in close connection with that of Gethsemane, called by it "Gennesaret").

The Synoptists, variously describing the Transfiguration in phrases about "light", "snow", "lighten", "fuller", "whiten", treat it as a manifestation of Christ's "glory"[5]. But was this the "glory" that Christ really contemplated? Did it even approach the "glory" contemplated in the Mosaic theophany vouchsafed in answer to the prayer "Shew me thy *glory*"[6]? Could John be satisfied with this Synoptic theophany (or

[1] See below **867** *a*, **981**.
[2] Is. vi. 1, Acts xxii. 17—18.
[3] See below **866—7**.
[4] See below **871**.
[5] See below **901** *b*, **906—7**.
[6] Exod. xxxiii. 18, see below **898** foll.

Christophany)? Did it come up to his own description of the "glory as of the Only-begotten full of *grace and truth*"? According to John, the one short prayer of Christ was preceded by "trouble" and followed by a mention of "glory"[1]. Was not this sequence in harmony with Christ's deepest teaching? To give it prominence and emphasis—was not this a leading object for the Fourth Evangelist, and was not this one of the reasons why, besides omitting the "glory" of the Transfiguration, he systematically described Christ as enduring, or subjecting Himself to, a threefold "trouble"[2]? To answer this question required further examination of those parts of the Fourth Gospel which speak of "trouble" and of "glory".

But after "trouble" and "glory" had been considered, there remained the question, "What as to prayer?" Did Christ indeed utter the prayer "Glorify thy name"? And as regards the Cup—where the Synoptists have two traditions, one (at the Agony) asking God apparently to (Mark and Luke) "remove" the cup, but the other (at the Lord's Supper) saying "From this moment I *shall assuredly not drink* of this[3]"—how comes it that Mark and Luke, according to R.V., use in the sense "remove" (applied to "cup") a word that elsewhere in Greek literature means for the most part "present" and always (so far as we know) has the latter meaning when applied to "meat", "drink", and especially to "cups" or "vessels"[4]? And why does John fasten on precisely these words "*I will assuredly not drink*," and take them in quite a different context as an indignant exclamation to the disciples, "*The cup* that the Father hath given me I [*if I am to take your advice*] *shall assuredly not drink it*[5]!"

---

[1] Jn xii. 27, "Now is my soul *troubled*."

[2] Jn xi. 33, "troubled *himself*", xii. 27, "now is my *soul* troubled," xiii. 21, "was troubled in *spirit*."

[3] Mk xiv. 25 &c., see below **934**.

[4] See below **931** *e*, **975—7**.

[5] Jn xviii. 11, see below **933** foll.

The prayer as to "the cup" could not be discussed without reference to the other prayer in Matthew's and Luke's context, "Thy will be done." And this in turn raised new questions. Why, for example, did the earliest version of this utterance in Gethsemane (Mark's) make it no prayer at all but a statement, "[It is] not [the question] what is my will but what is thine[1]"? Why did Matthew insert this petition—or utterance of resignation—in the formula called the Lord's Prayer, whereas Luke omits it? And, in this connection, why does Matthew say "Our Father *who art in heaven*" while Luke omits the italicized words? Why does John omit all mention of such a prayer? And, to come to John's insertions, why did the R.V. text give Christ's words as "What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour," when they could at all events be less incorrectly rendered (as in R.V. margin), "What shall I say? [Shall I say] Father, save me from this hour?", and probably most correctly, "*Why* should I say, Father, save me from this hour?"[2]? In order to answer these questions, some study was required not only of the Evangelical texts themselves but also of Jewish forms of prayer, and especially of those short forms taught by Rabbis to their pupils, many of which are current in the Talmuds.

Such answers as I have been able to find to all these questions will be set forth in the following pages. But the questions—at least the most important ones—are enumerated here in order to shew how a comparatively large book grew up out of what might seem to be a comparatively small subject, the Baptism of Christ, occupying less than 20 verses in the Four Gospels taken together. To these, however, must be added the non-canonical accounts, some of which, when compared (clause by clause) with the canonical, are of great value in indicating an Original that might explain and harmonize Evangelical variations. For example, it will be

[1] See below **931.**

[2] Jn xii. 27, see below **937—40.**

pointed out[1] that the Dove in Jewish literature is not (as with Greeks, Romans, and Christians) the type of love and peace, but for the most part the type of timorousness, repentance, mourning. Some very early oriental non-canonical accounts omit "*dove*" and insert the "*abiding*" (or "*resting*") of the Spirit on Christ. The Hebrew words that express "*dove*" and "*resting*" are almost identical. The facts point to the conclusion that there was *no* "*dove*" in the Original but only a mention of the Spirit as "*resting*" on Jesus. This is but one of many interesting conclusions to be derived from the non-canonical documents bearing on the Baptism. And the non-canonical accounts of the Transfiguration, few though they are, have even greater interest.

When I said above that "more results might be hoped for if more labour were expended," such was the "labour" that I had in view. It consisted mainly in a very full statement of the evidence and in varied classifications of it under such headings as "Voice from Heaven", "Prayer", "Glory", "Trouble". To take another instance. A question arose as to the origin of the words "Hear ye him" (in the account of the Transfiguration). The first "labour" was to go back to Exodus and Deuteronomy and to put side by side the two old Hebrew traditions (and the Targums on them) commanding Israel first to "hear" a "*Messenger*" and then to "hear" a "*prophet*" like unto Moses, and to trace the influence of these on Malachi, and then on the Christian Evangelists and Fathers[2]. Such an investigation as this, besides throwing light on the Synoptic "Hear ye him", might illustrate early Galilaean views of Christ as "Elijah", or as "Moses", or as "one of the ancient prophets"; but whether it did or not, one could not hope for any blessing on an effort to discover some new truth about this "Voice from Heaven" and about John's reason for omitting it, unless so obvious a preliminary had been first completed.

[1] See below **685**, **694**.

[2] See below **817—49**.

If anyone else had done this collecting and classifying, I would most gratefully have used and acknowledged it, as I have acknowledged my obligations to Trommius, Wetstein, Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, Levy's valuable dictionaries, and the published parts of the Oxford Gesenius[1]. But for the most part modern writers cover rather more ground with conjectures of their own, and much more ground with refutations of other people's conjectures, than with the full statement of the original texts to which they, and those who differ from them, alike refer. Consequently, when subjected to the old but never antiquated test, "Verify your references", the foundations of much that is popularly received as indisputable in N.T. criticism will be discovered to be unsound. For example, none of the articles on the Jewish Voice from Heaven that I have read appears to me to convey so much information as Pinner's collection of instances compiled more than sixty years ago but never, as far as I know, reprinted[2]. As to the elucidation of Greek minutiae bearing on the text of the Gospels, we are only beginning to understand the requirements of the problem. For example, many good scholars still assert with confidence that the Fourth Gospel speaks of being "born *again*" (when it really means "born *from above*"), supporting their assertion by half-quoting sentences of authors alien from John's style and by suppressing evidence on the other side from kindred authors[3]; and the same much-used Concordance that supports this erroneous view informs its readers that St Paul's undoubted use of

[1] I have also derived advantage from Resch's very valuable collection of extra-canonical parallel texts. Having made a similar collection on my own account previous to the appearance of his work, I have frequently been able to supplement its deficiencies from his book. Wherever I quote from Resch without being able to verify the quotation, my debt to him is acknowledged, as also any obligation to him for a conjecture as to the Hebrew original of the Gospels.

[2] I have consequently reprinted it in Appendix IV.

[3] *Enc. Bib.* 1833 n. 5.

"analyse" for "die"[1] is illustrated by a passage in Lucian about a boy who "being eighteen years old was (?) *dying*." But if you look at it you will find "Though he was [only] eighteen years old he was *doing analysis*"[2]!

Space has been gained for the full statement of positive evidence by omitting refutations of (what may seem to me) erroneous inferences from it. Only in a few instances, where a Biblical critic of first-rate ability or reputation appears to be misleading public opinion, have I thought it necessary to controvert. This will explain, to some extent, the absence of modern names from the foot-notes in the following pages. But another explanation is, I must confess, that having spent a great deal of time in examining the original Greek and Hebrew texts, I have not had much to devote to the study of mere opinions about them unless supported by fully-stated and well-classified evidence.

Is this craving for "evidence" unreasonable or antiquated? Surely it is not so, especially in the face of the steady progress of material science (which is based on classified evidence) as compared with Biblical criticism (which, till lately, has been based on authority, endowments, and sectarian prepossessions). Moreover, those who believe in a God, and in the Bible as the word of God, ought to feel specially prepared to find new evidence from generation to generation bearing on the Christian religion. The Koran has, I believe, few or no various readings and disputed or doubtful sections—at all events nothing to compare with the literary uncertainty (as regards words, texts, passages, and even whole books) that awaits those who approach the study of the Bible. But has not this uncertainty been, on the whole, productive of good for Christians?

[1] Phil. i. 23.

[2] Lucian *Philops.* § 14 (vol. iii. p. 41, ed. Reitz, who renders it "analysi uteretur"). Of course Lightfoot does not thus misapply Lucian.

May we not believe that these very imperfections—brought to light after many centuries like the faulty strata and broken fossils that interest a geologist—were intended to stimulate the sons of Japhet in the end to bring to bear upon their religion that restless spirit of truth-seeking which differentiates them from the sons of Shem? The Hebrew language—with its absence of vowels, paucity of tenses, and frequent use of identical letters to represent absolutely different meanings—what did God mean by entrusting the Law and the Prophecies of Israel to such a vehicle as this? And further—not to speak of four Greek Gospels constantly differing and sometimes appearing to contradict each other—if we are to believe Papias, that *Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and that people "interpreted it as they severally were able,"* what did He mean again by sending (according to our belief) His only Son to convey to mankind a revelation that was to be thus variously "interpreted" at the very outset of its literary history? Surely the Christian answer—or at all events a Christian answer—may reasonably be to this effect: "It was God's will that the followers of Christ should have burdens proportioned to their privileges, that their search after a fuller knowledge of the Lord Jesus should be continued through the ages, and that it should call into play all their faculties—pureness of heart, soundness of head, and robust patience under the labour of scientific investigation."

Strauss, towards the conclusion of his Life of Jesus, after describing the Gospels as recording many things that are false, many uncertain, and few certain, continues thus: "No, the happiness of man, or, speaking more intelligibly, the possibility of fulfilling his destiny.....it is impossible that this can depend on his recognition of facts into which scarcely one in a thousand is in a position to institute a thorough investigation, and, supposing him to have done so, then to arrive at a satisfactory result." But does not "the possibility of fulfilling his destiny" depend—at least for a son of Japhet,

and probably in the end for all mankind—on his recognition of the facts of anthropology, history, political economy, and science, into many of which not "one in a thousand," but we may rather say, not one in a hundred thousand, is "in a position to institute a thorough investigation"? It sounds plausible, and it has a fine democratic ring, to say that conclusions cannot be useful to the multitude unless they are discoverable by the multitude: but it is not true. Again, whereas Strauss maintains that the real figure of Christ has been so overgrown with corrupt traditions that it is no longer discernible, it is among the main objects of the present treatise to shew that this, though not without truth, is not true to anything like the extent that he supposes. Celsus is nearer the mark—though he expresses himself spitefully—when he describes the later Gospels as improving on the "intoxication" of the earlier[1]. Just as some of the later MSS. of the LXX correct the faults of the earlier by returning closer to the Hebrew, so—it is maintained—John often explains or corrects a tradition of Mark where Luke has misexplained it, or omitted it as inexplicable: and in many cases John can be shewn to be, in all probability, more accurate historically and more trustworthy spiritually than his predecessors.

In particular, as regards the Voice from Heaven, it will appear that the evidence of the Fourth Gospel outweighs that of the Three in establishing the following conclusions. (1) There was no objective Voice from Heaven at any time in Christ's life, but only such an answer as may be breathed by the Spirit of God in response to the prayer of the Son, echoing it with an Amen. (2) The real Transfiguration was a spiritual act of self-renunciation or sacrifice, in which the glory was of the nature of grace, truth, and love, not like "snow"[2], "light" or "whiteness"; and it did not take place on a material elevation, but in a spiritual region[3]. (3) The

[1] See *Enc. Bib.* 1766. [2] See **901** *b*. [3] See **981**.

prayer of Christ before His death was not an utterance of acquiescence or pious resignation, much less a struggle of will against will, but, in effect, a fervent petition that the Father would glorify His name: and such, too—active not passive—was the original tenor of the opening clauses of what we call "The Lord's Prayer", as recorded in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke[1]. (4) The "glory" of Christ consisted in His power so to undertake and endure "trouble" in His own soul and spirit as to remove it from the souls and spirits of His followers. (5) Lastly, His divine nature did not consist in a miraculous conception but in being from the beginning the eternal Word, Law, Harmony, Son, of the Father, taking our human nature as the Son of Joseph and Mary, and filling His disciples with the conviction that He, although Son of man, was also Son of God, because He was incarnate righteousness.

[1] See below **968**.

BOOK I

THE BAPTISM

CHAPTER I

DIFFERENT ACCOUNTS OF THE BAPTISM

§ 1. *The texts in English*

[**553**][1] THE Originals of the texts will be found in the first of the Appendices at the end of the book, but the texts are placed here in English that the general reader may survey the whole region to be traversed, before taking it stage by stage. Codex Bezae (commonly called D) and Mrs Gibson's Syro-Sinaitic version (commonly called SS) often present such important variations from the Canonical Gospels that their distinctive readings will be generally given, but not those of other MSS. or versions except in special cases.

Later on, the Canonical accounts, when taken in detail, will be sometimes rendered rather more literally than is the case in the Revised Version: but in this section, not to distract the reader from a general and rapid view of the subject, that Version is adopted without variation.

Mark's account is placed to the left as being the earliest of the Gospels, then Matthew, and then Luke. In O. T. it

---

[1] See References: **552** was the last subsection of the second part of this series, *The Corrections of Mark.*

is found that the earliest Greek translations (**32—3**) are generally more inaccurate than the later ones, and it has been shewn in a previous work by the author that this is probably true of Mark[1]. John is placed separately from the Synoptists, as he does not cover the same ground. His Gospel was probably composed 100—110 A.D.

(i) *The Synoptists*

Mk. i. 9—11 (R.V.)

[554] "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in (marg. lit. "into") the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon[2] him: and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased."

Mt. iii. 13, 16—17 (R.V.)

"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him.....And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him (marg. "some anc. auth. om. 'unto him'"), and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him; and lo, a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (marg. "This is my Son; my beloved in whom I am well pleased").

Lk. iii. 21—2 (R.V.)

"Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

[1] See *Clue passim*, and particularly **128—44**.

[2] "Upon", so R.V.; but really "into", see below (**679—84**).

D has "the heavens *opened*" (instead of "rent") and some other variations that will be found in Appendix I.	D is lost as far as "coming down." It then has "coming down *from the heaven* as a dove and coming *to* (or, *into*) him and behold a voice from the heavens saying *to him, Thou art* my Son..."	D "as a dove *to* (or, *into*) him and there was a voice from *the* heaven, *My Son art thou. I* (emph.) *have this day begotten thee.*"
SS is lost.	SS "Then came Jesus from Galilee unto John that he might baptize him in the Jordan,..... And when he was baptized and went up out of the water, lo, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending in the likeness of a dove, and it abode upon him: and a voice was heard from heaven, which said unto him, Thou art my Son and my beloved, in thee I am well pleased."	SS "And when all the people were baptized, Jesus also was baptized, and while he prayed, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the likeness of the body of a dove, and a voice was heard from heaven, Thou art my Son, and my beloved; in whom I am well pleased."

(ii) *John*

[**555**] Jn i. 28—34 (R.V.): "These things were done in Bethany (marg. "many anc. auth. read *Bethabarah*, some, *Betharabah*") beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

On the morrow he seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away (marg.

"beareth") the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is become before me: for he was before me (marg. lit. "first in regard of me"). And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, for this cause came I baptizing with (marg. "in") water. And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with (marg. "in") water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with (marg. "in") the Holy Spirit. And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God."

D is lost.

SS "These things he spake in Beth 'Abara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

And the [ ] day Jesus coming unto him and said [ ] of God who taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, A man cometh after me, and he was before me: because he existed before me. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the chosen of God."

(iii) *The Arabic Diatessaron*

[**556**] Tatian composed a Diatessaron, *i.e.* Harmony of the Four Gospels, in the latter half of the second century. The Arabic Harmony professes to be a translation of it, but of this there is no sufficient evidence[1]. It is, however, very early and probably based on Tatian's work.

[1] See the author's article on GOSPELS, *Enc. Bib.* 1838 n. 3.

iv. 1 "Then came Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan to John, to be baptized of him. Mt. iii. 13
And Jesus was about thirty years old, and it was supposed that he was the son of Lk. iii. 23*a*
Joseph. And John saw Jesus coming unto him, and said, This is the Lamb of Jn i. 29
God, that taketh on itself the burden of the sins of the world! This is he concern- Jn i. 30
ing whom I said, There cometh after me a man who was before me, because he was
before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, Jn i. 31
for this cause came I to baptize with water. And John was hindering him and Mt. iii. 14
saying, I have need of being baptized by thee, and comest thou to me? Jesus Mt. iii. 15
answered him and said, Suffer this now: thus it is our duty to fulfil all righteous-
ness. Then he suffered him. And when all the people were baptized, Jesus also Lk. iii. 21*a*
was baptized. And immediately he went up out of the water, and heaven opened Mt. iii. 16*b*
to him, and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in the similitude of the Lk. iii. 22*a*
body of a dove; and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Mt. iii. 17
Son, in whom I am well pleased. And John bare witness and said, I beheld the Jn i. 32
Spirit descend from heaven like a dove; and it abode upon him. But I knew him Jn i. 33
not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever
thou shalt behold the Spirit descending and lighting upon him, the same is he that
baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I have seen and borne witness that this is the Jn i. 34
Son of God."

(iv) *Justin Martyr* (c. 150 A.D.)

[**557**] (*Tryph.* § 88) "Consequently it was not because He [Christ] was in need of power that prophecy foretold the descent upon Him of the powers enumerated by Isaiah[2]: rather it was because those powers were destined no longer to exist.[3]... And for thirty years, more or less, He waited:

[1] The extract is preceded by Jn i. 28, "And that was in Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing" and by Mt. iii. 4—10, Lk. iii. 10—18, giving an account of the Baptist's acts and deeds.

[2] [**557***a*] This sentence does not belong to the narrative of the baptism, but will be found to have an important bearing upon that part of it which relates the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as a dove. It shews that Justin regarded the descent as fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (xi. 1) "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse...and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." These gifts of the spirit, Justin calls "the powers [of the Spirit] enumerated by Isaiah." The Hebrew makes them six, Justin makes them seven, see below **666—8**.

[3] [**557***b*] He means "no longer to exist *in the prophets of Israel* but to pass into the Messiah" (see below **711—5**).

until John came forward, herald of His presence and predecessor in the path of baptism as I shewed before. And then, when Jesus came to the river Jordan where John was baptizing, and when Jesus went down to the water, not only was a fire kindled[1] in the Jordan, but also, on His emerging from the water, [the statement] that the Holy Spirit alighted on Him as a dove is recorded in writing by the Apostles of this very [Jesus] our Christ.

[558] "And we know that it was not owing to any personal need of being baptized, or need of the descending Spirit in the form of a dove, that He came to the river; just as it was owing to no need that He submitted to be born and to be crucified, but it was for the sake of the human race.... And when Jesus came to the Jordan, being also supposed to be the son of Joseph the carpenter, and appearing 'without form[2]' as the scriptures proclaimed, and being supposed a carpenter[3] (for these works of carpentry did He work... ploughs and yokes, thereby teaching both the symbols of righteousness and also [the duty of] an active life)—[to resume]

[1] [557 *c*] If the reading is correct, Justin records as a fact, on his own authority, the kindling of the fire, but feels it necessary to adduce "Apostles" for the descent of the Spirit (see 1034 *a*—*c*).

[2] [558 *a*] "Without-form (*ἀειδοῦς*)." Comp. Is. liii. 2, "He hath no *form*," *εἶδος*. The adj. means (L.S.) (1) "invisible", (2) "unknown", (3) "shapeless", "formless", or "ugly". Justin takes it as (3). Jn (i. 26) "in the midst of you standeth one whom *ye know not*," favours (2), and comp. Ephrem (575) "not visibly distinguished from the rest." There is no instance in which (1) is fulfilled in the Gospels except Jn viii. 59 "was hidden" (not "hid himself").

[3] [558 *b*] "Being supposed a carpenter" appears to be a conflation of some phrase like "He (gen. abs.) being supposed to be [son] of the carpenter," *νομιζομένου τοῦ τέκτονος εἶναι*. From this Mk vi. 3 ("Is not this the carpenter?") may have been derived. But the question is complicated by the fact that *τεκτονος* "carpenter", might easily be confused with *τεκοντος* "parent".

If Justin had taken, as authoritative, Mk vi. 3, he could hardly have said "*supposed* to be a carpenter"; for the words imply that everyone knew the fact.

then, the Holy Spirit (and, for men's sake, as I said above, in the form of a dove) alighted upon Him; and a Voice from the heavens had simultaneously come [forth]—one that is also found among the sayings of David, when he[1], as it were in character, says [just] that which was destined to be said to Him from the Father, *My Son art thou, I* (emph.) *have this day begotten thee.* [Hereby, in effect, he was] saying that His 'birth' was to come-into-being *for men* at the moment from which the knowledge of Him was destined to come-into-being —*My Son art thou, I* (emph.) *have this day begotten thee*[2]."

[559] (*ib.* § 103) "For this devil[3]", [*i.e.* Satan, whose nature and name are explained by Justin in what precedes] "simultaneously with His [Christ's] going up from the river of the Jordan, when the Voice was uttered to Him[4], My Son art thou, *I* (emph.) *have this day begotten thee*, is recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles to have come to Him and to have continued tempting Him until he said to Him, *Worship me.*"

(v) *Celsus* (quoted by Origen)

[560] It is generally agreed that Celsus wrote in the course of the second century[5] and therefore, at latest, not long after Justin. His testimony is that of an enemy, but whenever he misquotes, or appears to Origen to misquote, the Gospels, the latter corrects him. Here he does not charge Celsus with any inaccuracy.

[1] [558 *c*] "When he" might mean "When Christ", and Otto takes it thus.

[2] [558 *d*] This involved sentence arises partly from Justin's natural uncouthness of style, partly from his ignorance of the word "subjective". He means that the begetting of the Son at the moment of the baptism was not objective, but subjective. He was begotten at that moment simply for ignorant "men" to whom the Sonship was then first revealed.

[3] [559 *a*] It will be found below (**577**) that Ephrem, commenting on the Diatessaron, supposes Satan to have been present at the Baptism and to have been perplexed by the fire and by the Voice from Heaven.

[4] "To Him". The Gk has "His voice", see Appendix I, **1036** *a*.

[5] *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, "Celsus".

[**561**] (Cels. i. 40) "After these [remarks, Celsus,] taking from the Gospel according to Matthew—but perhaps also from the rest of the Gospels[1]—the story about the dove that alighted on the Saviour when He was being baptized by (?) the side of John[2], desires to discredit what is [thus] said, as being a fiction."

Origen then complains that Celsus does not observe the right sequence of events:

[**562**] (*ib.*) "After the birth from a Virgin, this Celsus, who professed to know all our facts, attacks the [alleged] appearance of the Holy Spirit at[3] the Baptism in the form of a dove. Then, after this, he discredits the prophesying of the sojourning of the Saviour [on earth]. And after this he skips back to what follows immediately upon the birth of Jesus in the written [Gospel], namely, the narrative of the Star, and the Magi that came from the east to worship the child[4]."

---

[1] [**561** *a*] This shews that Origen regards Celsus as quoting freely, but not inaccurately, and not from apocryphal Gospels.

[2] [**561** *b*] The Gk is "*from* the side of John." The translation given above is obtained by altering the genit. into the dat. Two MSS. omit "from...John", one has "by the side of John," comp. "by the side of John" in Cels. i. 41 quoted below (**563**). See **1037** *a*.

[3] [**562** *a*] "At" is a repetition of the prep. rendered "by the side of" above, and later on. Perhaps we should read "by the side of [John] the Baptist (**1038** *a*)."

Origen is not here quoting Celsus: for the latter uses "bird" instead of "dove" and does not mention "the Spirit".

[4] [**562** *b*] Perhaps Origen does not make allowance for Celsus, who may have been perplexed by some of the "many" writers who "took in hand", as Luke says, to write the Life of our Lord. The "birth", γέννησιν, and the "prophesying" may possibly refer to the Annunciation. Apocryphal Gospels (**697—702**) describe a "dove" as literally descending on the "rod" of Joseph, who, being a descendant of David, might be called "the rod of Jesse," concerning whom Isaiah prophesied (xi. 2) "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him." The Apocryphal writers place this before the espousal of Mary to Joseph. Celsus may have confused this with the descent of the dove at the Baptism. See below **697—710**.

[563] (*ib.* 41) "Now it is the Jew, as his mouth-piece[1], who continues to speak as follows, addressing Him whom we acknowledge as our Lord, namely Jesus: 'When you were being washed,' says he, 'by the side of John[2] you say the appearance of a bird from the lower air[3] alighted on you.' Then Celsus' Jew takes the interrogative thus, Who saw this—*i.e.* what witness worthy of credit—this appearance? Or who heard a Voice from Heaven adopting you as Son in the family of God[4]—except that *you* say so and that you call as witness one, and only one, of those who have, along with you, been punished [by law][5]?'"

[564] This evidence is of great importance as indicating that in the second century (and probably at an earlier period) Christians were called on to answer the question, "Who saw the dove?" Origen says that (*ib.* 48) "No one *except John* is recorded to have seen "the heavens opened," and doubtless he intends this to imply that John also saw the dove (as stated in the Fourth Gospel). He adds that (*ib.* 44) "the Holy Spirit appeared to *Jesus* in the form of no other living thing than a dove." But he appears to favour the view that those who narrated the appearance of the dove and the Voice from heaven (*ib.*) did not hear the facts from Jesus or from John the Baptist, but that the same Spirit that related the facts of the Creation to Moses "related also to the writers

---

[1] "The Jew, as his mouth-piece," lit. "the Jew, for him." This refers to a previous statement (§ 28) about a Jew whom Celsus introduces as disputing with, and confuting, our Lord.

[2] [563 *a*] "By the side of John," see 561 *b*. One MS. has in margin "By the side of the Jordan." See 565 and 1039 *a*.

[3] "Lower air", see 643.

[4] Lit. "for God", see 793 *d* and 1039.

[5] The Jew means (no doubt) John the Baptist. At least Origen later on (Cels. i. 48) assumes this, and replies, justly enough, that it is not in the character of "a Jew" to use this contemptuous language about the Baptist.

of the Gospel the marvel that came to pass at the time of the baptism of Jesus[1]."

[**565**] It is difficult to explain the recurring preposition "*from-the-side-of*," or "*by-the-side-of*," John. The Editor of Origen's work suggests that "John" is an error for "Jordan", and there is much to be said for this view. But it is also possible that there once existed some early Jewish, or Ebionite, tradition to the effect that the Spirit passed "*out of* (παρά) *John*" *to Jesus—as it might be supposed to have passed out of Elijah into Elisha.* And Tertullian, it will be seen (**713**), takes this view that the Spirit *departed from John* when it came into Jesus. This view is scarcely compatible with the actual words of Celsus inserting "from the lower air." But, curiously enough, Origen's own version of them might be thus rendered: "The story about the dove that *alighted on the Saviour*, in the moment of His Baptism, [coming] *from* (παρά) *John*[2]." Virgil, describing the descent of the doves of Venus, the mother of Æneas, to help her son, says: "Before his very face *from heaven* they came in full flight and alighted on the green ground[3]." We might certainly have expected the Christian Sibyl (**583**), if not the hostile Celsus, to add "from heaven". But both omit it.

(vi) *The Testament of the XII Patriarchs* (ed. Sinker)

[**566**] This book was composed B.C. 135—103, but it abounds with Christian interpolations, probably from various hands and dating from A.D. 150 onwards[4]. The first part

[1] See note above **557** *c*, where it is suggested that Justin Martyr may have regarded the descent of the Spirit as a fact that could not be accepted except on the authority of the inspired Evangelists.

[2] See below (**690**) the story of the dove that came forth from Polycarp, *i.e.* his spirit.

[3] *Æneid*, vi. 191.

[4] See Article by R. H. Charles, Hastings' *Dict. B.* iv. 722—3.

of the extract is said to refer to John Hyrcanus, previously referred to in the Testament (§ 8) as "prophet, priest, and king[1]," but possibly the Christian editor, in applying it to our Lord, may have added the clause about the "star".

[**567**] (Levi 18) "Then the Lord shall raise up a new Priest, to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed. ...And his star shall arise in heaven, as a king, lightening with the light of knowledge....The heavens shall exult in those days, and the earth shall rejoice and the clouds shall be glad, and the knowledge of the Lord shall be poured upon the earth as the water of the seas. And the angels of the Glory and [the angels] of the face of the Lord[2] shall rejoice in him."

Now comes the passage referring to the Baptism:—

[**568**] "The heavens shall be opened, and from the sanctuary of the Glory (or, of Glory) there shall come upon Him sanctification (or, consecration) with a Voice as from a father, even as from Abraham the father of Isaac[3]. And the glory of the Highest shall be uttered on Him, and a spirit of understanding and sanctification (or, consecration) shall *rest* upon Him in the water.... And during His priesthood all sin shall come to an end and transgressors shall *rest* from

[1] [**566** *a*] Hastings, 722 *a* compared with 723 *a b*. The "new priesthood" is mentioned in Levi § 8, as exercised by "a king" in Judah, coming as the third of three descendants of Levi, the first two being Moses and Aaron. But here again Christian interpolation has been at work. Among these interpolations is probably the phrase, "[As for] the third, a new name shall be uttered on him" (comp. **915**—**6**).

[2] [**567** *a*] "The angels of the face" are those who see the face of God (Schöttg. on Mt. xviii. 10). The Editor cancels "and", so as to make "of the glory of the face." But this is not needed. "The Glory" may be a periphrasis for "God".

[3] [**568** *a*] See below (**795** *a*) for Jewish traditions that lay stress on the reply of Abraham to Isaac (Gen. xxii. 7), "Here am I, my son," as though it meant, "I am thy father." The writer appears to have compared the Voice from Heaven in the Gospels "Thou art my Son," with these words of Abraham.

[doing] (lit. *for*) evil[1], but the righteous shall *rest* in Him."

[**569**] The High-priest, John Hyrcanus, is the only character in pre-Christian Jewish history who is recorded both by Josephus and by the Talmud to have received a supernatural Voice from the "Sanctuary" (as the historian calls it) or "Holy of Holies" (as it is called in the Talmud). Some reference to this may have been converted by the Christian editor into a prediction of the Voice at Christ's Baptism[2]. For the rest, it may be noted (since attention must be called to it more than once in the following pages) that the writer lays great emphasis on "resting", which he repeats thrice in different connections, but makes no mention of a dove.

(vii) *Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes* (quoted by Jerome)

[**570**] The quotation occurs in Jerome's commentary on Isaiah, not written till A.D. 410. But in an earlier commentary on Matthew (A.D. 387) Jerome mentions it thus, "In the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which we lately translated into Greek from Hebrew, and which is called by most [? of them] the authentic [Gospel] of Matthew, it is written that...." The mere fact that it was in Hebrew postulates a very early date, and this is confirmed by the fact that such a scholar as Jerome thought it worth while to translate it, and mentioned—without rejecting—the belief

[1] [**568** *b*] It is just possible that the writer may have a sinister or ironical meaning, "Shall rest for [the purpose of enduring] evil [as their punishment]."

[2] [**569** *a*] See below **730—8**. The Voice to the High-priest John was "from the sanctuary", but had nothing to do with "consecration"; the Voice at the Baptism was regarded by some early Christians (**575**) as consecrating Jesus to the priesthood, but did not come "from the sanctuary". It will be shewn however, that one of the seven Jewish "heavens" might be confused with the "sanctuary".

that it was "the authentic [Gospel] of Matthew[1]." The words of Isaiah that lead Jerome to the subject of Christ's Baptism are these (xi. 1—2): "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse and a *Nazer*, i.e. *branch*, shall bear fruit out of his roots, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him." Jerome proceeds as follows:

[**571**] "As to that saying in Matthew's Gospel *He shall be called a Nazarene*—about which all theologians ask, and none can say, where it is written—learned Hebrews think that it is taken from this passage [about the *Nazer*, or branch]..... Upon this flower, then, which will suddenly spring from the stem and root of Jesse through the Virgin Mary, there will rest [so Isaiah prophesies] the Spirit of the Lord, because in Him [*i.e.* in Jesus] it pleased [God] that all the Fullness [of the Godhead] should dwell bodily[2]—[that is to say] not partially, as in the rest of the saints, but (according to their Gospel, the one written in the Hebrew language and in use among the Nazarenes) *There descended upon Him*" [*i.e.* upon the Nazer] "*the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit.*"

After an interval, Jerome continues thus:

[**572**] "Furthermore, in the Gospel above-mentioned we have found the following record, 'Now it came to pass, when the Lord had ascended from the water, there descended the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit and rested upon Him, and said unto Him, *My Son, in all the Prophets I was awaiting*

[1] For the dates of Jerome's comm., see *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iii. 48 *a*. The Jerome extract is from Kirchhofer (p. 454).

[2] [**571** *a*] Col. i. 19 "In him it pleased [God] that all the fullness should dwell," ii. 9 "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead *bodily*." Jerome quotes the first, and adds "bodily" from the second. See below (**665** *b*) on the corresponding use of "bodily" in Luke's description of the descent of the Spirit. Jerome takes it as meaning "in its whole body" as distinct from limbs. So we speak of "a *body* of evidence." A complete collection of Latin poetry is called *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, "the *Body* of the Latin poets."

thee, that thou mightest come, and that I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest, thou art my first-born Son, who reignest for ever."

Attention will hereafter be called to the fact that here again, as in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, there is a threefold mention of "rest", but no mention of the "dove".

(viii) *Ephrem Syrus*

[**573**] Ephrem was born about 308 A.D.[1] But his commentary, besides taking us back probably in many cases to the actual text of Tatian's Diatessaron (A.D. 150—70), contains stratum upon stratum of comment, some orthodox, some heretical, going back to very early times.

[**574**] The following rather long extract will be found of great use in helping the reader to understand the questions that suggested themselves to early Christians about the Baptism. But it is of importance negatively as well as positively: for while referring to "a light that arose on the waters," and a "Voice from heaven", as signs that perplexed Satan, it makes two mentions of the Spirit as "resting" on Jesus, but *no mention of the "dove"*.

[**575**] (*Comm. in Diatess.*, ed. Moesinger, pp. 42—3). "And the Holy Spirit, which *rested* upon Him when He was baptized, testified that He was a shepherd[2]. For through John He received the rank of prophet and priest. The rank of king[3], belonging to the house of David, He had received by birth, because He had sprung from the house

[1] *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* ii. 137 *a*.

[2] [**575** *a*] "Shepherd." This refers to what precedes. "Further, *Let us fulfil all righteousness* (Mt. iii. 15) [is said] because John was the porter of the sheepfold wherein was the flock of Israel gathered together. The Lord, therefore, entered to the flock, not by force, but by *righteousness*," i.e. with the assent of the "porter."

[3] [**575** *b*] "Prophet", "priest", and "king", are here combined, as in the *Test. XII. Patr.* quoted above about John Hyrcanus (**566**).

of David; but the rank of priest, belonging to the house of Levi, He received through a second birth[1], in the baptism of the son of Aaron" [*i.e.* in John's Baptism]. "Whoso believes that He received a second birth upon earth, let him not doubt that through this later birth, in the baptism of John, He received the priesthood of John.

"Whereas on that day many were baptized, the Spirit descended upon one and *rested*, in order that He, who was not visibly distinguished from the rest, might by this sign be discriminated from all [or, discerned by all][2]."...

[576] The next passage is important for many reasons. In the first place it mentions a "light upon the water," apparently corresponding to the "fire" mentioned by Justin. This is not in the Arabic Diatessaron, and its absence is one of many indications that the Arabic does not faithfully represent Tatian. In the second place it shews that the writer placed the Baptism after the words (Jn i. 29) "Behold the Lamb of God[3]." Apparently he thinks that John the Baptist, at the moment when he "seeth Jesus coming unto him and saith, *Behold the Lamb of God*", saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus—the sign previously appointed by God—and then testified to that effect. In the third place, there is no

[1] [575*c*] "A second birth." These words make it certain that the commentator (whether Ephrem or an earlier one) did not take Justin's view of the subjective nature of the regeneration of Jesus as the Messiah in baptism. They also make it almost certain that he accepted D's reading of the Voice from Heaven, "Thou art my Son, *this day have I begotten thee*."

[2] The Latin is ambiguous, see 1043.

[3] So does the present Diatessaron (see above 556). But this arrangement raises a difficulty. On the one hand the Baptist could hardly call Jesus "the Lamb of God" until he had witnessed the promised sign, the descent of the Spirit; but, on the other hand, the Diatessaron describes that descent as occurring later on in the course of the Baptism. Perhaps the compiler thought that the Baptist saw it first, as a prophet, spiritually, but the multitude afterwards. Discussions about the visibility of the descent caused great differences among early commentators.

mention of the dove. Lastly, there is the same emphasis that we noted in Justin, and shall note later on in Epiphanius, on the fact that our Lord "did not *need*" baptism. Ephrem is answering the question, "Why did not Satan tempt Jesus till His thirtieth year?" One answer is as follows:

[577] "Because no manifest token of His divinity had been given from heaven, and He appeared in humble guise as a common man...Satan delayed tempting Him until these things began to come to pass. And when he heard 'Behold, the Lamb of God cometh,' and 'This is he that is to take away the sins of the world,' he was indeed sorely astounded; yet he waited till He should be baptized that he might see whether He was baptized as one *in need of baptism*. And when, *from the light that arose upon the water and from the Voice that came down from heaven*[1], he perceived that He had descended into the Water *to satisfy needs* [*of others*] *but had not come to baptism for any personal need of His own*, then he pondered with himself saying, 'Unless I prove Him in conflict and temptation I shall not be able to find out who He is.'"

(ix) *The Gospel of the Ebionites*

[578] This is known only through the quotations made by Epiphanius in his Treatise *Against Heresies* (A.D. 374—7)[2]. Its prominent characteristic is a tendency to harmonize the

[1] [577 *a*] At this point we should have expected "and from the Spirit descending in bodily form as a dove."

Later on (p. 99 in a comment on Mt. xi. 2—14) Ephrem has "post testimonium Spiritus *qui descendit in similitudine columbae* et post vocem ex coelo factam: 'Hic est filius meus dilectus etc.'" But there is reason to think that this is from a different hand: for the writer on p. 99 *quotes Jn* i. 29 *differently from the forms of quotation of Jn* i. 29 *on pp.* 41—43. We have also seen that the writer of p. 42 seems to regard Christ as "born again" in baptism, and probably regarded the Voice as saying, "*Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*," but on p. 99 he quotes the Voice using the canonical phrase, "*This is my beloved Son etc.*"

[2] *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* ii. 149.

canonical Gospels partly by free alterations but more especially by the repetitions known as "conflations"[1]. For example, it gives *three* Voices from Heaven, two in the second person ("Thou art", "thee") addressed to Jesus, one in the third person ("This is") addressed to John the Baptist. In what looks like an attempt to abridge Luke's long account of the birth and parentage of John the Baptist, it takes Luke's opening words (Lk. i. 5) "There was in the days of Herod the king of Judæa [a certain priest by name Zacharias]," and applies them to a date more than thirty years later, when there was no king, but only a Roman governor, of Judæa[2]. But it inserts the non-canonical detail of a supernatural "light".

[579] (Epiphan. *Haer.* xxx. vol. i. 138) "It came to pass[3] in the days of Herod the king of Judæa there came John baptizing [with] a baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, who was said to be[4] of the family of Aaron the priest, son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all began to go out to him." Epiphanius then apparently passes over the sayings of John the Baptist—which Luke (iii. 4—19) gives at considerable length (Lk. iii. 18 "many other things") and which the Ebionite writer may have repeated—and passes to a statement about the baptizing of "the people" which Luke (iii. 21) alone records. This, at least, is the most probable meaning

[1] On "conflations" and "conflative versions", see *Clue* (**20—144**), and on the conflative tendency in Mark (**145—155**).

[2] [**578** *a*] Such an error is quite consistent with an early date. Comp. Justin (*Tryph.* 103) "Him who was then *King of the Jews and was called Herod, successor of the Herod who...slew all the infants in Bethlehem... and when Herod succeeded Archelaus...*".

[3] "It came to pass (ἐγένετο)," the same word as "there was" in Lk. i. 5.

[4] [**579** *a*] "Said to be." This looks as though the writer knew of Luke's Introduction and accepted it as probably accurate, but not as certain. He appears to introduce the priestly descent of John in order to suggest (as Ephrem above expressly says (**575**)) that the priesthood was passed on from John the Baptist to our Lord.

of "And after he [the Baptist] had said many things[1], he [the Ebionite] adds," with which preface Epiphanius introduces the Evangelist's account of the Baptism:

[580] "When the people had been baptized there came also Jesus and was baptized by John. And when He[2] came up from the water the heavens were opened and He (?) saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove that came down and came into[3] Him. And a Voice came (lit. came to pass) from the heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased*, and again, *I* (emph.) *have to-day begotten thee.*

[581] "And straightway there shone round the place a great light, on seeing which[4] (says [the Ebionite writer]) John saith unto Him, Who art thou, Lord? And again [there was] a voice from heaven to him[5] [*i.e.* John] *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* And then (says [the Ebionite]) John fell down before Him and said, *I beseech thee*[6], [my] lord, *do thou baptize me.* But He [*i.e.* Jesus] tried to hinder[7] him [*i.e.* John], saying, *Let be, because thus it is seemly that all things should be fulfilled.*"

---

[1] A less probable meaning is "And after he [the author] has said many things."

[2] [580 *a*] "Jesus", not "John", is almost certainly intended. Justin makes this clear by using "emerged", instead of "came up", from the water. As the words stand, it is barely possible that "he" may mean the person last mentioned, namely "John", who saw the vision as he came up from the water where he had been baptizing Jesus (see below **596, 645—52**).

[3] [580 *b*] "Into Him", not "to Him" (see below **679—84**).

[4] [581 *a*] "Which". The Gk has "whom", probably a corruption of "which" (**1045** *a*).

[5] [581 *b*] "To him," probably added in order to explain the change of person "This *is*" from "Thou *art*". The Voice is supposed to have said first "Thou *art*" to Jesus, and then "This *is*" to John.

[6] [581 *c*] "I beseech thee." Forms of this Greek verb mean "I have *need*," and the writer is probably confusing some tradition like that of Matthew, "*I have need* to be baptized" (see below **599—609**).

[7] [581 *d*] "Tried to hinder", we should have expected "hindered". But the writer is probably confusing some statement like that of Matthew that (Mt. iii. 14) "He [John] *tried-his-utmost-to-hinder* him (*i.e.* Jesus)."

(x) *The Sibylline Oracles*

[582] These poems are of widely different dates, perhaps from B.C. 181 to A.D. 267 or (in the case of one poem) later. But the two poems from which extracts will be given below are supposed to have been written about 234 A.D. by a Judaizing Christian[1]. Friedlieb's text is given in the Appendix and is followed here. But the variations of the MSS. are so great, and the principles upon which one should edit productions of this kind (some of which may be wholly, or partially, the work of illiterate or half-literate writers, ignorant of grammar and scansion, whose work has been touched up by later hands or improved by oral corrections, while others may be true literature, blemished by interpolations) are so extremely uncertain that the readers must be warned against basing important conclusions upon them. They prove, however,—and it is for this reason mainly that they are quoted—that the writer, or writers, recognized "the fire" as an element in the Baptism. One of the most able editors of these "Oracles" concludes that "all the Sibylline writings which have come from Christian sources are to be traced to writers in whom heretical or heterodox influences were predominant[2]." These extracts favour that conclusion; but they are all the more likely to be extremely ancient. Celsus (about 150 A.D.) says that some of the Christians are "Sibyllists" and accuses them of interpolating many blasphemies in the Sibyl's poems[3]. This indicates the possibility of a very early date indeed for the lines translated below.

[1] *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* iv. 645 *b*.

[2] *Ib.* p. 649 *a*, giving the opinion of Alexandre.

[3] [582 *a*] Orig. *Cels.* v. 61, vii. 53. In reply, Origen says (vii. 56) "He (Celsus) might have proved his assertion by producing some older copies which are free from the interpolations which he attributes to us." Celsus had unfortunately died about a century before Origen wrote: but if Origen could have challenged Celsus thus in the second century instead of the third, Celsus would probably have been able to satisfy him on this point.

(*Orac. Sibyll.* ed. Friedlieb, Bk vi. ll. 1—7)

[583] (i) "The great Son of the Immortal [God] fit-subject-of-song from my heart I proclaim,
To whom the Most High who begat Him delivered a throne for a gift
When He was not yet begotten: since (or, when) in [the] flesh that was given Him
He was raised up, having washed away [? the defilement of flesh] in the stream of the river
[Even] Jordan, who is borne onward with blue foot drawing his waves,
Who, *having escaped from fire*, shall be the first to see God [in His] sweet [nature]
[God, I say] in (or, through) the Spirit coming [lit. becoming] on the white wings of a dove."

This literal translation leaves the reader, as the Greek leaves him, free to suppose that Jesus was (1) "raised up" as it were from the dead to a new life, from the life of the flesh to the life of the Spirit, having washed away the defilement of the flesh of Jesus and having been born again as Christ: or (2) it may mean "raised up" as a Prophet, or as a Deliverer, to do "in the flesh" the work of redemption appointed by God. Also (3) "who" may mean Jordan, "escaping from" the fire that seeks to dry up its stream: or it may mean the Son "escaping from" the "fiery trial"[1]. These three points are uncertain. But it is certain that the writer in some way connects "fire" with the Baptism of Christ, and highly probable that he regards our Lord as "not yet begotten" in the character of the Messiah till the Baptism had taken place.

[584] (ii) The following extract appears to imply the doctrine of Cerinthus[2], that the Spirit flew down on Jesus as a dove at the Baptism and flew back again to the Father at the crucifixion.

[1] See below **617—25.**

[2] See below **589, 665, 689** *c*, **690.**

(*Ib.* vii. 66—70)

"Hapless [country], thou knewest not thy God, who once washed
In the waters of the Jordan; and [the] Spirit lighted on Him
Who, before, both of earth and of the starry heaven
Had been the Maker by the word of the Father[1], but by the pure Spirit[2]
(After putting on[3] flesh) He swiftly flew to the house of the Father."

[585] (iii) The next extract appears to refer to the Jewish custom of purifying a leper when healed, one bird being killed while another was allowed to fly away.

(*Ib.* 79—84) "..... Having taken wild birds,
Pray thou and send them fixing thy gaze heavenward,
And sprinkle water on the immaterial fire[4], and cry thus aloud,
He who, as Father, begat thee the Logos, O Father[5], I sent forth a bird
Swift announcer of words, [the] Word, with pure waters,
Performing thy baptismal sprinkling, *whereby thou didst shine forth from the fire.*"

The one important conclusion from this corrupt passage is that the writer again confirms the legend of "fire"[6].

(xi) *Epiphanius* (A.D. 374)

[586] The following extract from Epiphanius emphasizing, as it does, the "going down", or "descending", or "condescending", of the Saviour, and also His "not needing" to be

[1] Another reading is "the Maker, the Word of (lit. belonging to) the Father."

[2] Friedlieb connects the words thus, "after putting on flesh by the pure Spirit." The above rendering means, After doing the work of the Incarnation, He was raised up from the dead by the Spirit and returned to the Father.

[3] A very slight change would give "after putting *off* flesh" (**1047** *a*).

[4] "The immaterial fire", lit. "pure fire". On the meaning see below **625** *a*.

[5] Friedlieb's text is given above and literally translated. But it is corrupt and possibly hopelessly so. Otto (see Appendix, **1048** *a*) would read "Spirit" for "O Father".

[6] On the meaning the Sibylline writer attached to "shine forth from the fire," see **621—5**.

baptized, will enable the reader to realize the questions that suggested themselves to Christians, long before the days of the writer and probably in the first century, as to the "need" of baptism for Christ, as to its actuality and other points. For example, did the purifying influence come from the Spirit alone? or from the waters that are above the heavens? or from the waters of the Jordan? and, if the last, how could they impart purity to One perfectly pure in Himself?

[587] (Epiph. *Anaceph.* § 7, p. 153 C—D) "...He had reached the reckoning of [thirty] years[1]—the reckoning of the number of months, having been borne in the womb, 'born of a woman born under the Law[2],' having come unto the Jordan, having been baptized by John; not *needing* [the] washing, but because of the following out of the incarnation[3] under the Law, not disturbing what was righteous, that there might be fulfilled, as He Himself said, all righteousness; that He might shew that He had put on true flesh, true incarnation; *coming down* to the waters, giving rather than receiving, bestowing rather than *needing*; enlightening[4] them, imbuing them with power to be a type of those that should hereafter be perfected in Him; in order that those who have believed in Him in truth, and who have the faith in the truth, may learn that He was truly incarnate, truly baptized: and that thus, through His *condescending*, they too, coming [to baptism], may receive the power of His *descending*[5] and may be enlightened by His light-bringing, being fulfilled-with-conviction according to (?) that which is said in the Prophet, unto a transmutation of power, unto bestowal of

[1] [587 *a*] Txt. ἐν ἀριθμῷ ἐτῶν λογισθείς. Perhaps λ meaning "thirty" (comp. Clem. 407 ὡς ἐτῶν λ) has dropped out before the λ in λογισθείς.

[2] Gal. iv. 4.

[3] "Incarnation", ἐνανθρώπησις: more literally, "humanization".

[4] "Enlightening them", φωτίζων αὐτά, *i.e.* the waters: see below (588, 617—25).

[5] "Descending", see below 588 *a*.

the salvation of the power of bread, [power] received from Jerusalem, and of the strength of water[1]."

[588] We have seen above (**557**) that two of the details here mentioned by Epiphanius, viz. the "enlightening" of the water and the "descending" into the water—which we might have been disposed to take as metaphorical (the latter being typical of the above-mentioned "condescension")—are both mentioned in the second century as facts by Justin Martyr (who, however, has "fire" instead of "light"[2]).

[589] The following describe the belief of Cerinthus and others:

(1) (*Haer.* xxviii. 1, vol. i. p. 110 D) "That *Christ came down to* (or, *into*) *Him* [*i.e.* Jesus], that is, the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove."

(2) (*Haer.* xxx. 16, vol. i. p. 140 B) "*Christ having come to* (or, *into*) *Him* [*i.e.* Jesus] from the [realm, or One] above in the form of a dove."

[590] The following is almost unique in mentioning the

---

[1] [587 *b*] "Being fulfilled...water", πληροφορούμενοι τῷ ἐν τῷ Προφήτῃ ῥητῷ. Petavius suggests in marg. πληρουμένου τοῦ. He prints as a quotation the Latin of εἰς μεταλλαγὴν δυνάμεως, εἰς παροχὴν σωτηρίας τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ λαμβανομένης καὶ τῆς ἰσχύος τοῦ ὕδατος: but, contrary to his custom, he does not indicate in the margin the passage referred to. It resembles Isaiah iii. 1 "The Lord of hosts doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah stay and staff, the whole stay of bread and the whole stay of water"; Κύριος σαβαὼθ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσαν, ἰσχὺν ἄρτου καὶ ἰσχὺν ὕδατος. The words "staff", "stay", משענה, might perhaps be confused with some form of ישע, so as to be rendered "salvation".

[2] [588 *a*] Ephrem quoted above (**577**) mentions the "going down" as well as the "not needing". "He had *gone down* into the water as *the Satisfier of needs* [*of others*] but had not come to baptism as though He were [Himself] *in need*." He also mentions the "light".

Resch quotes (on Mt. iii. 14) a comment of Hilary (who died 368 A.D.) "ipse quidem lavacri egens non erat," and (*Agrapha*, p. 364) from the Severian Liturgy a unique tradition, *omitting*, *but implying*, *the negative*, "O God...who wast baptized in the midst of Jordan...*as though thou neededst it* (tanquam indigens)." See **606** *a*.

descent of the Spirit as following, not the "coming up" from the water but the "going down":

(*Ancor.* cxix. vol. ii. p. 121 B) "But the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove went down upon Him *when He had come down*[1] into the waters."

[**591**] The following medley represents the disciples as hearing the Voice and the Spirit as first "settling on" Jesus and then "coming upon Him":

(*Anac.* 8, vol. ii. p. 154 B) "Having come up from the Jordan, in-the-moment-of-hearing the voice of the Father in the hearing of the disciples who were present[2], in order to shew who was being attested, and the Holy Spirit coming down in the form of a dove...but the Spirit *settling upon Him and coming upon Him* in order that He who was being manifested might '*appear*' [*unto men*].....in order that the Son might 'appear' (?) in truth[3] and might fulfil the saying [of Baruch, iii. 37] '*And after these things he appeared upon earth and held converse with men.*'"

This last extract is also important because it apparently regards Him who was "attested" by the descent of the Spirit as "appearing" in the character of Messiah not only to John the Baptist but also to those present. It may be added that Petavius, for "coming upon Him", has, "insinuated itself *into Him* (in ipsum)." That, no doubt, is demanded by the sense. But it cannot be obtained from the Greek text without emendation.

§ 2. *The differences to be considered*

[**592**] The reader has probably noticed in the last section that the Synoptists, as well as the other authorities, differ

[1] Κατεληλυθότα, Petav. "Scrib. Κατεληλυθός."

[2] Εἰς ἀκοὴν παρόντων τῶν μαθητῶν. Does this mean "in the hearing of people present, namely the disciples"? or "the disciples being present so as to hear it"?

[3] Ὁ υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ὀφθῇ (? ἀληθινῶς as below ἀληθινῶς πειρασθείς, or o may have dropped out after c in γιοc).

greatly from one another as to the details of the Baptism. Moreover Luke, as given in Codex D and the Latin versions, differs from Luke as given in R.V. The Nazarene Gospel quoted by Jerome, the Ebionite Gospel quoted by Epiphanius, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Sibylline Oracles, differ from all the Canonical accounts. Justin Martyr, though agreeing with Codex D's version of Luke in one important point—the words uttered from heaven to Jesus—differs from it in other respects, and has what amounts to a version of his own. In these circumstances we might expect that John would intervene—as he does on several occasions where Luke omits, or deviates from, Mark's narrative—in order to clear up the obscurity[1].

[**593**] For example, Mark says that the Voice spoke *to* Jesus, "*Thou* art my beloved Son"; Matthew, that it spoke *about* Him, "*This* is my beloved Son." But, according to John, if we may judge from his silence as well as from his statement, there was no voice from the clouds, but merely a message from God conveyed to the Baptist alone, and this, apparently, to the heart (by what we call revelation or inspiration), as follows: (Jn i. 33) "Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, this is he that is to baptize in the Holy Spirit." There was indeed testimony uttered aloud, but it was not from God, except so far as God may be said to have spoken through (Jn i. 6) "a man sent from God whose name was John." This testimony, according to most MSS., mentioned the Synoptic word "*Son*", but according to other weighty authorities, it used the word "*Elect*", thus: (Jn i. 34) "And I have seen and have borne-witness that this is the Elect (or, Son) of God[2]."

[1] For instances, see the Author's Article on GOSPELS, *Enc. Bibl.* 1768.

[2] [**593***a*] "Elect", placed by W.H. in marg. of their first ed., was removed by them afterwards. But it has been confirmed by the discovery of SS, and is therefore given priority above.

[594] Again, what was seen, according to John? The message of God mentioned simply (Jn i. 33) "the Spirit descending and abiding." But the preceding verse gives us the testimony of the Baptist to what he saw, as follows: (Jn i. 32) "I have beheld the Spirit descending *as a dove*[1] from heaven and it abode on him." Apparently, then, the "dove" was not the special sign mentioned by God. Supposing the Spirit to have descended *in the form of* a "cloud" (which is sometimes the emblem of the Divine Glory) it might still have been described—*with reference to the circumstances of the descent*—as being "*like* a dove" seeking its nest, or flying to some resting-place. Compare Isaiah and the Psalms: (Is. lx. 8) "Who are these that fly *as a cloud, and as the doves* to the windows [of the dove-cotes]?" (Ps. lv. 6) "Oh that I had wings *like a dove!* Then would I fly away and *be at rest.*" John only once mentions the "dove", but he twice mentions—what the Synoptists altogether omit—that the Spirit "*abode* on" Jesus. This subordination of the emblem, and this reiterated statement that it "*abode*" on Him, are calculated to dissipate the impression that a bodily dove is intended, and to emphasize the "abiding", or in-dwelling, of the Spirit. To this point we must return later on.

[595] Again, in the description of the descent, Mark mentions "the Spirit", Matthew "(the) Spirit of God", Luke "the Holy Spirit": but John ascribes to God the words "On whomsoever thou shalt see *the Spirit* descending and abiding on him, he it is that is to baptize in (*the*) *Holy Spirit.*" Also "the *Spirit*", not "the *Holy Spirit*", is mentioned by him previously as "beheld" by the Baptist. John,

[1] [594 *a*] "Dove", περιστερά. The word is more correctly rendered by R.V. "pigeon" in Lk. ii. 24 to distinguish it from τρυγόνων in the context, "turtle-doves", and will be thus rendered hereafter on those occasions where there are special reasons for bringing out its exact meaning (see 685 *b*).

then, does not adopt the corrections of the later Evangelists. For some reason or other, in this narrative, he reserves the phrase "(the) Holy Spirit", as Mark does, for the statement about "baptizing".

[**596**] Lastly, as to the question asked by Celsus, "Who saw it?" The text of Mark—as may be seen above and will be seen more clearly hereafter—favours indeed the view that he regards Jesus, and not the Baptist, as the seer, yet it leaves a loop-hole for doubt. Matthew closes the loop-hole by inserting "Jesus" in the context. Luke relates the whole, not as a matter of "seeing", but as a fact ("it came to pass...the heaven *was* opened"). John relates the whole as the "seeing", not of Jesus, but of the Baptist.

All these differences, illustrated by the non-canonical accounts, will now be discussed in short stages, following the order of Mark.

CHAPTER II

WHAT PRECEDED THE BAPTISM?

§ 1. *Canonical accounts*

[597] THE earliest Evangelists, before the act of baptizing, place a brief statement about the "coming" or "arrival" of Jesus. Luke (at all events in our present text) omits all mention of it. It should be noted that, whereas Mark says "came *and was* baptized," Matthew has "arriveth...*to be* baptized by him," words that, by themselves, might be taken to mean *a mere intention*. Some, who were unwilling to believe that Jesus condescended to be baptized, might use such a tradition for their purposes, maintaining that He did not really undergo the rite, perhaps because the Baptist reverentially declined. We do not know whether Matthew knew of any such traditions. But, if he did, he could not have contradicted them better than by the story that he, and he alone, adds at this point, namely that the Baptist actually expostulated with Jesus but was overruled.

[598] The Hebrew use of *vaw* for "and" and "in order to" may encourage loose translation even where *vaw* is not used. Hence (2 Chr. xxxvi. 6) "and bound him in fetters *to* (-ל) carry him away" might be translated "bound him in fetters *and* carried him away," which is actually the rendering of the LXX both there and in the parallel 1 Esdras i. 40[1]. This may possibly have originated Matthew's "to be baptized".

[1] [598*a*] Comp. 1 K. xiii. 33 "whom he would he consecrated *that* (ו) there might be," LXX "*and* he became", 2 Chr. xxiii. 19 "*that* none should enter," LXX "*and* there shall not enter in," Dan. ii. 13 R.V. and Theod. "*and*...were to be slain," A.V. "*that* they should be slain," and

But, whatever may have been the origin, it will appear below to have resulted in unhistorical developments. In the following parallel passages the tradition inserted by Matthew alone is italicized.

Mk i. 9.	Mt. iii. 13—16.	Lk. iii. 21.
"And it came to pass in those days there came Jesus of[1] (ἀπὸ) Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized in (lit. to) the Jordan by John."	"Then arriveth Jesus from[2] (ἀπὸ) Galilee [coming] unto (ἐπὶ) the Jordan to (πρὸς) John[3] [*to be baptized by him. But he tried to hinder him with all his might, saying 'I have need to be baptized by thee, and comest thou to me?' But Jesus answered and said to him, 'Suffer [it] now: for thus it is becoming for us to fulfil all righteousness.' Then he suffereth him*]. And Jesus, when he was baptized...."	"But it came to pass when there had been baptized all the people,—Jesus, too, having been baptized and being in the act of praying...."

so LXX. On the other hand note Prov. xvi. 9 "but (ו)," LXX "that". In Lam. i. 19 both R.V. and LXX render ו (*i.e.* "and" or "but") by "(in order) to". In Dan. ii. 13, ו is followed by parallel ל (**240—2**).

[1] [**598** *b*] Ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ N. τ. Γ., "there came Jesus *of* (not, *from*) Nazareth of Galilee," is similar to Mk xv. 43 ἐλθὼν Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, "there came Joseph *of* (not, *from*) Arimathæa." Comp. Judg. xii. 8 (R.V.) "Ibzan *of* (Heb. lit. *from*) Bethlehem," also 2 S. xxiii. 20 (1 Chr. xi. 22). This being (apart from the title) the first mention of Jesus in Mk, it is natural that there should be some statement either of parentage or of domicile.

[2] [**598** *c*] "Then arriveth Jesus from Galilee," τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. As Matthew has already described the parents of Jesus as (ii. 22—3) settling in Nazareth of Galilee, a statement of domicile would be superfluous: and the domiciliary use of "from" is more frequent with the names of towns than with those of provinces. Probably, therefore, "from" is right in Mt., though "of" is right in Mk.

[3] SS has "unto John that he might baptize him in the Jordan."

§ 2. *Non-canonical accounts*

[**599**] We shall be better able to understand the origin of Matthew's insertion if we place beneath it the following non-canonical statements :—

(1) The Ebionite Gospel, after the Voice from Heaven, has "And then John falling at his feet began to say, '*I beseech* (δέομαι) *thee, my lord, baptize thou me.*' But He [*i.e.* Jesus] tried-to-hinder him [*i.e.* John], saying, 'Suffer [it to be as it is] (or, Let be), because thus it is seemly that all things should be fulfilled.'"

[**600**] (2) The Nazarene Gospel says, in a passage quoted by Jerome[1], "Behold the Lord's mother and brethren said to Him, 'John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins ; let us go and be baptized by him.' But He said to them, 'Wherein have I sinned (peccabam, ? peccavi) that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless perchance this very thing that I have said is [a sin of] ignorance.'"

We have seen above that many writers reiterate that Christ "had *no need* to be baptized." This Gospel, in effect, puts such a tradition in the first person, "I have *no need* to be baptized."

---

[1] [**600** *a*] Kirchhofer (pp. 453—4) from Hieron. l. 3, *adv. Pelag.* c. 1, "In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthaeum."

[**600** *b*] How a Gospel might be called "according to Matthew" and also "according to the Apostles," may be illustrated by a quotation of Epiphanius from the Ebionite Gospel quoted above (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13, vol. i. 137) "And He was about thirty years old who chose *us*...and He opened His mouth and said,...I chose John and James, sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, and *thee*, *Matthew*... *You* therefore I desire to be *twelve* (!) Apostles." In this extraordinary confusion (which seems to make "twelve" out of eight) it is at all events clear that Matthew is specially addressed. Possibly he might be regarded as commissioned to write in the name of all the Apostles.

[601] (3) Resch (*Agrapha*, p. 363) quotes a Baptismal Liturgy of Severus, which, after relating the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, says, "*Our Lord* said to *John*, 'Come, baptize me.' But *he* said to *Him*, 'It cannot be that I should take [anything as] a prey (Fieri non potest ut rapinam assumam).'" These last words appear to refer to Philipp. ii. 6, "*counted it not a prey* to be on an equality with God." If so, they would seem to be appropriately uttered, not by John but by Jesus, and the pronouns should be reinterpreted, so as to make the whole run thus: "*John* [perceiving our Lord to be the Son of God] said [to *Him*], 'Come, baptize me.' But *He* said to *him*, 'It cannot be, &c.'"

[602] In the Ebionite Gospel, the word used for "*beseech*" (δέομαι) means also "*need*". Hence, if Matthew's peculiar statement that "Jesus came to John *to be* baptized" was interpreted as meaning that He came requesting to be baptized, and if—perhaps to shew the Lord's humility—this stronger word, "*beseech*", was substituted for "request", the consequence would be an ambiguous sentence which might mean either (1) "He came *beseeching* to be baptized" or (2) "He came *having need* to be baptized."

[603] This would naturally evoke contradictions or various versions. In the way of contradiction we have found Justin and Ephrem, above, reiterating that Christ "had no need to be baptized," and we may now add the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus (991). "For this cause the Saviour received baptism (though He Himself was *not in want of it*), that He might consecrate the whole element of water for them that are to be born again."

To the same effect writes Epiphanius, who places the clause "having no need of baptism," after such clauses as "born of a woman, born under the Law," as though it were —as indeed it is—an article of faith[1].

[1] See 586—8.

[**604**] Having regard to the early traditional repetition of this phrase "*not needing* to be baptized," and to the similarity, in Greek, of the Ebionite "*I beseech thee* do thou baptize me," it seems probable that the latter is a corruption of the former; and this is the more likely because the Greek letters would facilitate a confusion between the two[1].

[**605**] On the Hebrew-translation theory, this problem of Christ's "not needing" to be baptized, and yet submitting to be baptized, is illustrated by the above-quoted passage from the Gospel of the Nazarenes[2]: "Behold the Lord's mother and brethren said unto Him, 'John the Baptist baptizeth for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him.' But He said unto them, '*Wherein did I sin that I should go and be baptized by him?*—Unless perchance this very *utterance of mine is a* [*sin of*] *ignorance.*'" It is by no means improbable that the whole of this interesting tradition is derived from a Hebrew gloss misinterpreted owing to the fact that the same Hebrew word is capable of meaning, in slightly different forms and contexts, (1) friends

[1] [**604***a*] See *Fayum Papyri*, p. 50 inscr. about 70 B.C. ΔΕΟΜΕΝΟΥ, an error for ΔΕΟΜΕCΟΥ, "I beseech thee".

If the margin contained ΔΕΟΜΕ̄ΟCΟΥ "needing it not", the dropping of o before c would produce ΔΕΟΜΕ̄CΟΥ which, when read as ΔΕΟΜΕCΟΥ, would mean "I beseech thee", and might be assigned to John. If these words were assigned to our Lord, they might be changed to ΔΕΥΡΟΜΕCΥ wrongly taken as "*Come do thou* [baptize] *me*" (as in the Baptismal Liturgy above-quoted) so as not to represent Jesus as "beseeching".

In Is. xxvi. 18 *σου* is an error for *οὐ*: in Job xx. 13 *οὐ* is repeated (from the preceding *αὐτ-οῦ*) so as to spoil the sense: Is. xxxvii. 12 *οὓς* = 2 K. xix. 12 *οὐ* (A *ους*): *σου* is prob. corrupt for *τοῦ* in 1 S. xviii. 18 (A), 1 K. xxii. 12 (see context); and for *μου* in Ps. cxix. 59 (conversely in 2 S. vii. 15, 16).

Wherever Greek corruption is at work in the Gospels, we may reasonably suppose that oral tradition may have been at work, and such a word as ΔΕΟΜΕ lends itself to oral error. For this reason Matthew may have substituted *χρείαν ἔχω*, which is unmistakeable.

[2] Kirchhofer, p. 454 (Hieron. lib. iii. *adv. Pelag.* ch. 1) (**600**).

and acquaintances, (2) conscious of sin, (3) ignorance[1]. But in any case it indicates that Hebrew as well as Greek developments would probably be at work, enlarging the narrative of the circumstances preceding Christ's baptism so as to prevent His "condescension"—as Epiphanius calls it—from being taken as an indication of "need", "deficiency", or "imperfection of the nature of sin."

§ 3. *"I need to be baptized by thee," origin of this tradition*

[606] The very large number of non-canonical traditions about Christ's "not needing", or "not requiring", to be baptized, affords some presumptive evidence that any canonical tradition on this point *inserted by one Evangelist alone* (609 *b*) is not part of the Original[2]. More especially is this the case in Matthew's tradition—which omits the negative and imputes the words "I need" to John—because it seems superior to the negative tradition in heightening the Saviour's dignity, and yet is omitted both by Luke and by John.

[607] Another reason for suspecting Matthew's tradition is, that it is not inserted in the Ebionite Gospel, which, as we have seen, has a "harmonizing" tendency; that is to say, instead of omitting one of two discordant versions, it modifies and combines them. Thus we have found it actually making

[1] [605 *a*] Suppose, for example, a gloss to this effect, "Why? Not because He knew evil?" "Why," in Heb., when it means "For what inducement?"=מדוע, "*knowing* what?" which is easily confused with מודע, or מידע. The latter, though strictly "acquaintance", might (Gesen. 396 *a*) represent "kinsman". "Evil" (rendered רע by Delitzsch in 1 Cor. iv. 4) might be read as "friend" and "companion". "Knew no(t)" might be taken as "ignorance". The gloss, being taken as speech or dialogue, might be amplified as above. For "not knowing sin", comp. 2 Cor. v. 21 as well as 1 Cor. iv. 4.

[2] [606 *a*] See also the passage briefly referred to above (588 *a*) from the Severian Liturgy (Resch, *Agr.* p. 364) "O God, who in the midst of Jordan wast baptized as man by John...who, *as though thou neededst it* (tanquam indigens), wast baptized in the river Jordan."

three Voices from Heaven! Why then, does not the writer insert at all events Matthew's peculiar tradition that Jesus came to John "*to be* baptized"? And surely it would have been easy to make the Baptist say, first, (Matthew) "I have need to be baptized by thee," and then to add as a climax the Ebionite tradition, "I entreat thee, [my] lord, baptize me." The Ebionite writer makes no attempt to do this. And whereas Matthew describes John as "trying his utmost to *prevent*" *Jesus*, the Ebionite says that Jesus "tried to *prevent*" *John!* Lastly, according to the former, Jesus said "*Suffer* [*it to be so*]" meaning, "*Suffer me to be baptized by thee*"; but according to the latter, He used the same Greek word in an entirely different sense, "Let be", "Desist", i.e. "*Do not beseech me to baptize thee*[1]."

The Ebionite is obviously, in these last two instances, not harmonizing or "conflating" Matthew, but correcting him; and these two instances lead us to make a similar inference about the one before, namely, that the Ebionite regarded his "*I beseech thee*, baptize" as a correct version of "*I have need to be* baptized."

[608] Now it cannot be urged that the Ebionite makes all these alterations for any doctrinal tendency, since both he and Matthew are writing on the same lines, *i.e.* explaining the superiority of Jesus to John, and shewing that the latter, not the former, needed to be baptized. We are therefore led to infer that the Apocryphal writer—if he knew Matthew's version, as he almost certainly did—rejected it as *historically* erroneous. And it is not difficult to see why. Matthew represents the Baptist as saying to Jesus, "I have need to be baptized by thee" *before the Baptism*, and therefore, it would seem, before the descent of the Spirit. But according to the Fourth Gospel, *the descent of the Spirit was the sign given by God to the Prophet by which he was to recognize his successor.*

[1] On the various meanings of ἄφες, see Appendix II (1056—66).

How then could the Prophet use the language of recognition *before the appointed sign*, which alone would justify him in using it? This indeed is a question that the Ebionite might very well ask: and we cannot be in the least surprised that he regarded Matthew's episode as not only confused and distorted in expression, but also out of place: "It ought to have come," so he probably, and many others, argued, "after the Baptism. Then and not till then, in the moment when the Spirit descended, the Baptist recognized his Master, and suppliantly besought Him saying '[I have been ignorantly baptizing thee, but] do *thou* (emphatic) rather, [my] *lord*, *baptize me*.'"

[609] It is a recognized sign of an interpolation or gloss that the editors, or scribes, who transfer it from the margin, place it in different positions. Here we have this sign. If we had to choose either Matthew or the Ebionite, the latter would seem to be preferable. But a third course is to reject both. This, *i.e.* rejection, is almost certainly right. And, further, it is fairly probable that both are misunderstandings arising out of a very ancient Greek tradition that our Lord came to Baptism though He "needed it not"[1].

---

[1] [609 *a*] It may be objected that the whole of Mt.'s tradition has not been explained above, and in particular the words (Mt. iii. 15) "(*a*) *Suffer it to be so now*...(*b*) *then he suffereth him*."

Concerning (*b*), space here merely permits the observation that the same Gk is repeated—and again by Matthew alone—a little later on (Mt. iv. 11 τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν) in quite a different sense, "then he [the *devil*] *suffereth* him [i.e. *Jesus*]," meaning "*leaves* Him *alone*". This points to conflation.

As regards (*a*), see Appendix II.

[609 *b*] It might be objected that "Matthew the Publican might have access to information not available for Mark." But would it not be "available" for John, the son of Zebedee *and disciple of the Baptist*, whom such objectors would probably regard as the author of the Fourth Gospel?

CHAPTER III

THE PLACE OF THE BAPTISM

§ 1. *Divergences*

[610] THE Gospels mention the place as follows :

Mk i. 9.	Mt. iii. 13.	Lk. iii. 21.
(lit.) "came ..... and was baptized *to* (εἰς) the Jordan by John."	"cometh (lit. arriveth).....*unto* (ἐπί) the Jordan *to* (πρός) John to be baptized by him."	"...when there had been baptized all the *people*."

Jn i. 28 "These things came to pass in *Bethany* (v. r. *Bethabara*) *beyond* (πέραν) the Jordan where John was baptizing."

Compare Orig. *Cels.* i. 40–1 "being washed, or baptized, *by-the-side-of* (παρά with dat. or gen.) John (v. r. marg. Jordan)."

What is needed to explain these divergences is some Hebrew word that could mean "*by the side of*," or "*near*", but could also be confused with other prepositions, and with the word "*people*". These requirements are fairly satisfied by the preposition used in Genesis (xxv. 11) "Isaac dwelt *by* (עִם) the well," which means (when without vowel points) not only "*with*", "*near*", "*by*", but also "*people*"—an identity that results in numerous confusions[1].

[1] [610*a*] Dan. ix. 26, R.V. "people", LXX "with" μετά; conversely 1 S. xiv. 45, R.V. "*with* God", LXX "*the people* (ὁ λαός) of God." For

[611] But further, as a preposition, עם means (Gesen. 768*a*) "in the house of" as applied to persons, but "near" as applied to places; and in the latter sense it is sometimes mistranslated by the LXX as though it meant "in"[1]. This being the case, a statement in Hebrew that Jesus was baptized "*near* Jordan", *i.e.* in some stream flowing into the Jordan, might easily be assumed to mean a baptism "*in* Jordan". Luke may have taken "*near*" as meaning "*people*", perhaps also taking "Jordan" as "going down[2] [to be baptized]," or as "John". At all events he inserts a clause about "the people"

other instances of confusion or conflation see Deut. iii. 1 (AF), Josh. viii. 14, 1 Chr. xii. 18, xix. 6, Ps. xlvii. 9, cx. 3, Hos. xi. 12 &c.

[1] [611 *a*] Gen. xxxv. 4 "*by* Shechem," LXX "*in*", Judg. xviii. 3 "*by* the house", LXX "*in*" (A "by", παρά), 2 S. xxiv. 16=1 Chr. xxi. 15 "*by* the threshing-floor," LXX (S.) "by," παρά (Chr.) "*in*". In Judg. xix. 11 "*by* Jebus," LXX probably read עד (for עם) so as to give "*as far as* (ἕως) Jebus."

[611 *b*] In Gen. xxv. 11 "Isaac dwelt *by* (עם)," Targ. Jer., instead of עם, has סמיך, which is often used (*ib.*) with על or ל (Levy, *Ch.* ii. 170 *b*) to express "near", "with" &c. But its verbal form is also frequently used in the phrase "laying hands on" as a sacred rite, either on a sacrifice or on one who is being ordained to the priesthood. Now we have seen above that Ephrem regarded John as ordaining Jesus *to the priesthood*. Hence there would be a temptation to render the prepositional phrase "near upon" (lit.) "laying on" as though it meant "lay *hands* on". Moreover "*on the bank of* the Jordan" might be expressed in a Hebrew gloss by "*on the hand of* the Jordan": and this, being combined with "laying" by conflation, might confirm the view that the text indicated a "laying on of hands." Hence we cannot be surprised that the Severian Liturgy, quoted above (606 *a*), actually contains a tradition about "laying hands on". As is natural with glosses of this kind, it conflates, making the agent first John, and then Jesus: "John drew near after the manner of a priest blessed [by God] and *placed his right hand* on the head of his Lord....Then he [John] said to Him [Jesus], Only *place thy right hand* on my head, and I am [thereby] baptized." [In the text as quoted by Resch, *Agr.* p. 363, "Tum dicebat ei (Dominus noster)" is a manifest error for "dicebat ei (Ioannes)".]

[2] Comp. Orig. *Comm. Joann.* lib. vi. 25, Ante-Nicene Library, p. 371 "'Jordan' means 'their going down'." For "Jordan" interchanged with "John" see above 563 *a*, 565.

being "baptized", and omits all mention of the place of baptism. John, perhaps stepping in to correct what seemed to him false impressions, says that the place was not the Jordan but "*beyond* Jordan", and gives its name as "Bethany", or "Bethabara".

§ 2. *Where was Jesus baptized?*

[**612**] The facts point to the conclusion that neither "Bethany" nor "Bethabara" is the historical place of the baptism. Origen expressly tells us that he has "been in the district (*γενόμενοι ἐν τοῖς τόποις*)," to enquire as to the footsteps of Jesus and His disciples, and that, beside the well-known Bethany of Judæa, "there is no other place of the same name in the neighbourhood of the Jordan[1]." This is very strong as negative evidence.

[**613**] The positive is much weaker: "But *they say* (*λέγουσι*) that Bethara[2] is pointed out by the bank of the Jordan where they describe (*ἱστοροῦσι*) John as having baptized." From this it appears that (1) the place had *not* been thus "pointed out" to Origen although he had "been in the district." (2) The phrase "they say" does not even indicate certitude as to the fact of "pointing out", still less as to the identity of the place "pointed out" with the actual site. (3) The language suggests that after (and perhaps long after) Origen had returned from his visit to "the district", some one gave him this vague information. (4) The spelling, whether as in Origen's text or as emended to suit his etymological remark, does not agree with "Bethabara". This is all the stronger evidence because "Bethabara"—*i.e.* "Place of passage" (either

[1] *Ib.* p. 370. (Huet, p. 131 A.)

[2] [**613** *a*] Such is the spelling of the text, *Βηθαρᾶ*. O.'s remark that it means "House of *Preparation* (*κατασκευῆς*)," from בראּ, indicates that we should read "Bethbara". Later on, it is "Betharaba" (Huet, 133 B), but "Bethara" again (Huet, 136 A).

as being "Place of a ford" or "Place of a ferry-boat") by which one "passed over Jordan"—makes a very appropriate name, not, it would seem, likely to be corrupted by scribes or others.

[**614**] Probably John's text sprang, in part, from an attempt to correct the current impression that Jesus was baptized *in* the Jordan. And here he may very well have been right: the baptism may have taken place, not *in* the Jordan but in some affluent of it. Supposing the original to have been "by", the word used above of Isaac "dwelling *by* the well," it should be noted that the corresponding Greek word in that passage of Genesis might easily be corrupted into "beyond" owing to the similarity of the two words and the greater frequency of the phrase "*beyond* the Jordan" as compared with the rare "*by* Jordan"[1]. In Joshua (vii. 7) "*beyond* Jordan", LXX has "*beside* Jordan", and a similar error occurs in Numbers (xxii. 1). We have seen some slight reason above (**563** *a*, **565**) for thinking that Celsus may have described Jesus as being baptized—not "by the side of John" but—"by the side of (*παρά*) Jordan." John may have felt that this interpretation, implying (as it did) "on the bank of," gave a wrong impression, because the place was at some distance from the Jordan.

[**615**] As regards the rival claims to denominate the precise spot—Bethany, Bethara, Bethbara, Bethabarah, Betharabah,—the question is so complicated by the various spellings, and alleged derivations, of the Talmudic name Bethany, as well as by the frequent interchanges of the roots *abar*, and *arab*, that it must be reserved for discussion in a separate treatise. But it may be noted that John elsewhere describes the Baptist as baptizing, later on, at a place called Ænon, or "fountains", because there were many waters there. A hypothesis that the "Bethany beyond Jordan", mentioned

[1] "By" = παρά, "beyond" = περᾶ.

by John alone, is a corruption of Beth-Ain, or Beth-Ænon, *i.e.* "Place of Fountain, or, Fountains," would have at all events a great deal more probability than most of the alleged derivations of the name of the Bethany near Jerusalem. Levy (ii. 265 *b*) quotes a tradition to the effect that the water of the Jordan is to be rejected (for some specially sacred purposes) as being unclean[1]. This is hardly likely to have influenced the Baptist: but a "place of fountains" might well be far more convenient for baptizing than a shallow in a wide river, especially if the baptism was accompanied with exhortation, or preaching, where a rocky recess or amphitheatre might be found convenient.

[616] On the whole, there is a fair positive probability that Jesus was baptized *near* the Jordan and not actually *in* it, and that the names Bethany, Bethabara, &c. arose from various attempts to explain this fact. Perhaps one gloss said, "a place of springs," another "beyond Jordan"; and John's tradition conflated the two as "(a_1) a place of springs (*i.e.* Bethany) (a_2) beyond Jordan." But a third gloss may have combined "place of", *beth*, with "beyond", *abar*, read by some as *arab*; and hence came the rival readings "Bethbara", "Bethabara", "Betharaba". The negative probability, that none of the names in John represent actual places, is so strong as to approach certainty[2].

[1] [615 *a*] Neubauer says (p. 31) "La Mischna" [i.e. *Parah* viii. 9] "dit que les eaux du Jourdain et du Jarmouk ne peuvent être employées dans le Temple, parce que ces deux fleuves reçoivent des eaux impures." But Levy (quoting *Parah* viii. 10) says indeed that these waters are פסולים, "to be rejected" because they are "waters of mixture (תערובות)"; but adds that the purpose for which they are to be rejected is their use "as water of sprinkling (Sprengwasser) with the ashes of the Red Heifer." If so, there is nothing in the statement to lead to the conclusion that a Jew would not use the Jordan for the baptism of a proselyte.

[2] [616 *a*] It is probably a mere coincidence that in Josh. xv. 61 the Greek "Aenon" occurs in LXX along with the Greek "Tharabaam", where the latter ought to be "Betharabah" and the former "Middin".

[616 *b*] In giving the preference to "Bethany" above rival readings,

John may have been influenced by the similarity of the name to that of Bethany near Jerusalem, so that our Lord might be supposed to have begun and ended His work in places nominally identical.

[616 *c*] If the original stated that Jesus was baptized "among the *followers* of John," this might be expressed in Hebrew by "in the *House of* (Beth-) John" (Levy i. 224 *b* quotes "*House of* Hillel" &c. = οἱ περί). Now in Sirach l. 1 "John (יוחנן)" = Ονιας. Hence, if taken for a *place* beginning with the prefix *Beth-*, the phrase would be transliterated as *Bethonias*, which might easily be corrupted into *Bethanias*, and taken to mean "Bethany".

[616 *d*] See **734**, where the Voice from Heaven in honour of Hillel is said by the Jerusalem Talmud to have descended in the *House of Gadia*, which might be transliterated as *Bethgady*, but by the Babylonian in the *House of Goria*, i.e. *Bethgory*. But there the context seems to indicate that "house" is to be taken literally. Schwab, however, renders it *Beth-Gadia* (twice, vol. vii. 338, 344). Neubauer's index recognizes no such place. It was in Jericho.

CHAPTER IV

"GOING UP FROM THE WATER"

§ 1. *"Fire" or "light"*

[617] AFTER the baptism, the first detail mentioned by Mark and Matthew relates to "going up out of the water."

Mk i. 10.	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 21.
"And straightway he [? John or Jesus] *going-up out of the water*."	"But, having been baptized, Jesus straightway *went-up from the water*[1]."	"And as he was *praying*."

[618] The Nazarene Gospel has, like Matthew, "when *the Lord went up* from the water."

[619] The Ebionite Gospel has, like Mark, "was baptized by John, and as he (? John or Jesus) came up from the water."

[620] Justin Martyr has "And *a fire was kindled in the Jordan and when He had emerged from the water*," and, later on, "simultaneously with His *going up from the river of the*

---

[1] [**617** *a*] Codex *a* has a conflation: "And when he was baptized a great light shone around from the water so that all that had come thither were afraid. And Jesus having been baptized, he straightway went up (et baptizato Jesu, confestim ascendit)," and similarly S. Germanensis. Strictly speaking, the last quoted Latin words ought to mean "But when Jesus had been baptized, *he*, i.e. *John*, went up." But doubtless the writer meant "Jesus went up".

Jordan." The former statement is apparently supported by an appeal to Apostolic documents:—"the Apostles of this very Messiah of ours have written[1]."

[621] The Sibylline Oracles perhaps describe Christ as destined to be the first who, "*having escaped from fire,*" shall see God manifested by the Spirit "with the white wings of a dove"; they also mention a "bird" in connection with the "sprinkling" of baptism, and say, "thou wast revealed *from fire*[2]."

[622] The Diatessaron, in its present form, makes no mention of "fire"; but that there was something of the kind in its original, or at all events in a very early edition, is shewn by the commentary of Ephrem Syrus quoted above, which refers to "the light that rose up upon the waters[3]."

[623] The Ebionite Gospel, besides mentioning the "going up" of Jesus at the outset of the narrative, has at the close, "And straightway there shone round the place a great light, seeing which John saith to Him, 'Who art thou, Lord?'"

[624] It appears, then, that there were two views about "the fire":—one, that of Ephrem and the Ebionite Gospel, that it was a splendour of homage proceeding from a divine source, the other, supported by the Sibyl, that it was a fiery trial, proceeding, it would seem, from Satan. According to the latter, the fire would be a hostile element, extinguished by the waters (from above the heavens) that descended with the Spirit, just as in the LXX version of Daniel (iii. 49) an angel of the Lord (called in the Syriac version "an angel of dew") descends and makes the furnace wherein are the Three Children "to be as a wind of dew."

[1] See **557–9**. [2] See **583–5**.

[3] [622 *a*] Resch also quotes (*Agrapha*, p. 358) "Ephraem Syr. Hymn. I. in Epiph. v. 18 (Nach Usener, p. 62). Es trat Johannes heran und betete den Sohn an, dessen Gestalt ein ungewohnter Lichtglanz umstrahlte," and "Ephraem Syr. Hymn. XIV., v. 48 (Nach Usener p. 62). Da er die Taufe empfangen, stieg er alsbald empor und sein Licht erglänzte über die Welt."

[**625**] And that this was a very early belief is demonstrated by Irenaeus, who when referring to the descent of the Spirit on Jesus at baptism, says that we could not be made one in Christ without "the water from heaven," and compares the Holy Spirit to "dew", which departed from rebellious Israel and descended upon the Lord that it might be diffused throughout all the Earth; (Is. xi. 2) "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might (virtutis), the spirit of knowledge and piety, the spirit of the fear of God." This same Spirit again, he says, the Lord "gave to the Church, into every land sending from heaven the Paraclete, where (?) also[1] the Lord says that the Devil, like lightning, has been cast forth. Wherefore the *dew of God is needful for us, that we may not be burned up*....." The whole passage rather favours the view that Irenaeus accepted the tradition of a hostile fire arising on the water, as also does a fragment of Clemens Alexandrinus mentioning (991) "the waters that are above heaven" in connection with Baptism, and saying that the spiritual baptism (988) "averts the immaterial fire[2]," or, in other words, "the Spirit given us from above, being incorporeal, overpowers not only the elements but also the forces and sovereignties of evil." But these various interpretations of the "fire" (or "light") "rising up"

[1] Iren. iii. 17. 3 "mittens de caelis Paracletum ubi et Diabolum, tanquam fulgur, projectum ait Dominus." "Ubi" seems loosely used for "unde"—as "here", in English, for "hither".

[2] [**625** *a*] Does this explain Sibyll. vii. 81 Ὕδωρ δὲ σπείσεις καθαρῷ πυρί, "thou shalt pour water on the *pure* fire," *i.e.* the fire that is immaterial, νοητόν? Otherwise, it would be obvious to suggest that καθαρω, or καθαρο, is an error for καθαρῷ, *i.e.* καθαρόν, so as to give "pure water on the fire."

[**625** *b*] The Severian Liturgy (Resch, *Agr.* p. 363) has (p. 24) "calefactae erant aquae quando venit filius Dei ut baptizaretur in medio Jordanis," and (p. 88) "ascendit mediis ex aquis et exortum est lumen ejus super terram." This is consistent with a distinction between a "fiery trial" (of Satan) followed by a divine light.

(or "shining"), so far from militating against the antiquity of the detail, indicate ancient controversies about a difficult tradition, which probably existed long before the controversies began.

§ 2. *Parallels, or Precedents*

[626] On the hypothesis of one Hebrew Original ramifying (through mistranslations and glosses) into the existing divergent traditions, we have to seek some word or phrase that might originate (1) Luke's tradition about "Jesus praying", (2) Mark's "going up from the water," (3) the non-canonical tradition about "light" or "fire". If this Hebrew phrase could also originate (4) some parallel Johannine tradition, *e.g.* "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," its claim to be the Original would be greatly strengthened. A fifth line of evidence might be called psychological: that is to say, (5) evidence pointing to similar antecedent details in the History of Israel, so that a Jewish prophet might be naturally predisposed to receive a vision in this or that form, or at all events a Jewish evangelist might naturally have supposed the prophet to have seen it thus.

[627] Taking this last consideration first, we are led to the narrative of Elijah, receiving an answer of fire from heaven—almost the last great public act of his life before the appointment of his successor Elisha. The parallelism drawn, especially by Mark and Matthew, between Elijah and the Baptist, makes the precedent of the ancient prophet particularly applicable. In the baptism of Jesus, the Baptist (at least according to the Synoptists) is also performing *his* last great public act—henceforth retiring into silence in their pages to make way for his successor, the Messiah. The Elijah-narrative relates that, after the prophet had built an

altar, he poured water on the sacrifice and round the altar, and (1 K. xviii. 36) "It came to pass *at the offering of the oblation*[1] that Elijah the prophet came near and said, O Lord, the God of Abraham...," and the fire of the Lord descended. *The waiting for the time appointed for the evening sacrifice* is in obvious harmony with the prophet's building the altar in the name of the Lord: the two acts indicated a revival of the Law.

[**628**] Another great name connected with the restoration of Israel is that of Daniel. Daniel tells us that, when he understood the number of years for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, he set his face unto the Lord God to present his supplication for the holy mountain, and (Dan. ix. 21) "Whiles I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel ...being caused to fly swiftly touched me *about the time of the oblation of the evening*." Lastly, the phrase occurs in connection with Ezra's revival of religion (Ezr. ix. 4—5): "I sat astonied *until the oblation of the evening*. *And at the oblation of the evening* I arose up from my heaviness ...and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God and said..."

---

[1] [**627** *a*] 1 K. xviii. 36 (lit.) "*at* (ב) *the-going-up-of* (עלות) *the oblation* (המנחה)": R.V. amplifies so as to make the meaning clear, "at [the time of] the offering of the [*evening*] oblation." This is expressed fully in the Hebrew of Dan. ix. 21. "Evening" is inserted in the Hebrew of Ezr. ix. 4—5; 2 K. xvi. 15; Ps. cxli. 2.

Gesen. (585 *a*) says concerning 1 K. viii. 36 that מנחה is "usually regarded as" = "oblation of the evening," but that this use of "oblation" for "oblation of the evening" is a "much later usage". According to this view, 1 K. xviii. 29 and xviii. 36 should have been rendered "until (or, at) the-going-up-of *the oblation*"; but the context (1 K. xviii. 29) "when *midday was past*," makes it clear that the "oblation" is that of the evening and not of the morning. In later times, "oblation", *by itself* (*apart from context*) (Levy iii. 153 *a*), came to mean "evening oblation".

§ 3. *The Original may have mentioned "the going up of the Oblation"*

[**629**] These facts suggest an examination of the LXX version of the Elijah-narrative; and we find that (1 K. xviii. 36) "at the going up of the oblation" is omitted by the LXX, but Codex A (which, as a rule, is closer to the Hebrew than Codex B is) has "And it came to pass *at the going up* [of] *the water* that Elijah cried-aloud to heaven and said ...[1]." If the italicized words are a scribal corruption of "at the going up of *the oblation*," it is worth considering whether our Synoptic tradition about "*going up from the water*" may have been a confused translation or corruption of a similar original[2].

---

[1] [**629** *a*] The context repeats the phrase "going-up-of the oblation" twice, first (1 K. xviii. 29) preceded by "until", then (1 K. xviii. 36) preceded by "at". In the first case, "going up" is retained ("the going-up-of (*ἀναβῆναι*) the sacrifice"): but in the second instance—possibly because the repetition of the phrase seemed to be corrupt, inasmuch as the oblation *had already* been offered up—Codex B omits the phrase.

[**629** *b*] Codex A has (1 K. xviii. 36) *καὶ ἐγένετο κατὰ ἀνάβασιν τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀνεβόησεν* Ἠ. *εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. The context thrice mentions a "trench (תעלה)" as filled with water: and, confusing *θαala* with *θαλασσα*, it renders the word meaning "trench" by "*sea*". The similarity of מנחה to מנהר "from the *river*", might lead a perplexed translator from the notion of "sea" to the notion of "*river*", which he paraphrased as "water". The interchange of "river" and "water" is so natural as hardly to need comment, but comp. above (**557**, **559**) Justin (*Tryph.* § 88) "from the *water*", (§ 103) "from the *river Jordan*." But, more prob., *τουδωρ* is Gk corr. for (Aq. and Symm.) *τουδωρου*. There are errors and interpolations in the context, but they do not affect the phrase in question.

[2] [**629** *c*] For confusions between "going up" and "offering", comp. 2 Chr. ix. 4 "his *ascent* by which he *went up*," LXX "the *burnt-offerings* that he *offered up*." In the parallel 1 K. x. 5, the R.V. has txt. "*ascent... went up*," marg. "*burnt offering...offered.*" Ezek. xl. 40 "As one *goeth up*" (marg. "at the *stairs*"), LXX "*whole burnt-offerings*".

§ 4. *Traditions resulting from this*

[**630**] (1) "At the going up of the oblation" implied "at the hour of *prayer*," which might be expressed in Greek by "simultaneously with *praying*". Then it might be inferred that the words meant "while *Jesus was praying*." This would account for Luke's distinctive tradition, "having been baptized *and being in the act of praying*[1]."

[**631**] (2) We have seen above that "going up", when applied to a sacrifice so as to mean "being offered up", is frequently confused by the LXX with literal "going up", "ascent", "staircase", &c. So here, early Western Evangelists may have been perplexed by the phrase—used in connection with Christ's baptism in the river Jordan—"And Jesus came and was baptized in the Jordan by John, and behold *the oblation went up* and he saw the heavens opened." Familiar as they would be with such expressions as "Christ *our Passover*", "He delivered Himself up as *Sacrifice and Oblation*," and, generally, with the view that Christ was "our

[1] [**630** *a*] In other places Luke alone mentions "praying", *e.g.* (i) Mk iii. 13 "He ascendeth to the mountain," Lk. vi. 12 "He went forth to the mountain *to pray*." (ii) Mk ix. 2, Mt. xvii. 1 "He taketh them up into a high mountain alone by themselves," Lk. ix. 28 "He ascended the mountain *to pray*." So Mk vi. 46, Mt. xiv. 23 (Lk. wanting) describe Jesus as going up "to the mountain *to pray*," where Jn vi. 15 has simply "withdrew again to the mountain." The subject, which requires special investigation, is touched on below (**981**).

[**630** *b*] Here "mountain" is not mentioned. But Luke may have inferred prayer from the fact that it was the time of the offering of the oblation; comp. Ps. cxli. 2 "Let my *prayer* be set forth before thee as incense, and *the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice*." This would be in accordance with the precedents of Ezra, Daniel and Elijah, all of whom were engaged in prayer "at the going up of the oblation." Luke may have paraphrased the meaning ("at the hour of prayer") so as to bring out what he considered the inner meaning for Christians: "For *us*, the lifting up of His hands was 'the evening sacrifice.'" Comp. *Tryph.* (§ 72) "This Passover is our Saviour" (from ? "Esdras").

Oblation", some might naturally take this as being an Eastern way of saying that *our Lord* "went up" from the river. Possibly some might acquiesce in this with a feeling that "the Lord's ascent" typified something more, the "going up" of a spiritual sacrifice, or the "emerging" (as Justin Martyr calls it) to a new life or course of action.

[**632**] Of course if some translators confused מנחה with מנהר, so as to render "*oblation*" by "from the *river*", and if other translators or editors conflated it so as to produce, "Behold *the Oblation* went up *from the river*," the temptation would be much greater to regard the words as meaning "*Jesus* went up".

John distinctly says that the Baptism took place "beyond Jordan", and we have seen reason to suppose that the Original may have been "near", not "in", Jordan. This might lead editors to substitute "water" for "river". The total result of these causes would be the version of Mark (?) and Matthew, "*Jesus* went up from the *water*."

[**633**] (3) The evening sacrifice is regularly denoted in New Hebrew by the word *Minchah*. But the evening sacrifice consisted of a *lamb*; and in Biblical Hebrew the Minchah meant *the meal-offering* that accompanied the sacrifice of a lamb every morning and evening. It is used for the first time thus in Exodus (xxix. 41) "And the second lamb thou shalt offer between the two evenings according to the *Minchah*[1] of the morning and according to the drink-offering thereof thou shalt do thereto, for a sweet savour, a *fire-offering* to the Lord."

[**634**] If therefore *Minchah* was used in the Original to mean "sacrifice", an Evangelist or Editor might naturally

[1] [**633***a*] This refers to the words italicized in Exod. xxix. 40, "And with the one lamb *a tenth part* [*of an ephah*] *of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil*." This defined the *Minchah* of the morning sacrifice. That of the evening was to be "according to it", *i.e.* the same.

insert in the margin the word "fire-offering", to indicate that it was here used, not Biblically as "meal-offering", but post-Biblically as "oblation", meaning the whole offering, including the lamb. But "fire-offering" differs only by one letter from "fire", and it has been shewn elsewhere that the two are easily confused[1]. Thus, instead of "the sacrifice went up," there might be substituted the tradition, widely and authoritatively attested in the first three centuries, "a fire went up." This might be facilitated by the alteration of the Biblical "went up" into the New Hebrew "was kindled", as in Kings (1 K. xviii. 29) "until *the going up of* the oblation," where a Targum has a word that may mean "go up", but may also mean "kindle" (being used in Ps. lxxviii. 21, "a fire *was kindled* against Jacob")[2].

[635] (4) But, on the supposition that *Minchah* was corrupted into "from the river", we are able to explain the origin of the tradition about "*light*": for the Biblical verb נהר, besides meaning "stream" applied to water, means also "*stream*" *applied to light*: and the latter sense, though extremely rare in the Bible, is extremely frequent in New Hebrew. Thus the Jerusalem Targum (Exod. xiv. 20) substitutes for the Biblical "it gave-light" the form in question "streamed with light", מנהר, *which in Biblical Hebrew could mean nothing but "from the river"*[3]. The verb is applied in late Hebrew to Rabbis, and even to the Messiah, as being "enlighteners", or "enlightened"[4]. By substituting "*streaming*

[1] [634 *a*] See 289 *a* for confusions of "fire", אש, and "fire-offering", אשה, in 1 S. ii. 28, Numb. xviii. 9, as possibly originating narratives that God "answered *by fire*".

[2] [634 *b*] Levy, *Ch.* ii. 47 *b* נסק. Comp. Judg. vi. 21 "*there went up* fire," ἀνέβη, but A ἀνήφθη, the word used by Justin (557) to describe the kindling of the fire on the water.

[3] [635 *a*] In O.T. נהר, "shine", occurs only in Ps. xxxiv. 5, φωτίσθητε, Is. lx. 5 (LXX om. or render "fear", as fr. ירא). In Dan. ii. 22 the noun form is correctly rendered, but in Dan. v. 11, 14 LXX om. or paraphrase, Theod. renders "light and understanding" by one word, γρηγόρησις.

[4] Levy iii. 351–2.

with light" for "*from the river*", we should obtain a tradition similar to that quoted above from the Hymns of Ephraemus, "When He received baptism, He came up straightway *streaming with light*," interpreted by Ephraemus as "and His light streamed over the world." Or this might be combined with "from the water", as in the above-mentioned Severian Liturgy[1]. A confusion of this kind would explain all the traditions about "*light*".

[**636**] (5) At the beginning of the second century, the author of the Fourth Gospel would find it necessary to review, and choose between, or adopt, or improve upon, a mass of traditions, which, upon our hypothesis, began with "the going up of the oblation," and branched out into "going up from the water," "praying", "fire" on the water, "light" on the water. Attempting to revert from the materialistic traditions about "fire" and "light", and from the commonplace "going up", he might find an old comment correctly explaining for the Gentiles that this *Minchah* was really typical of "Christ our Oblation", not being a mere meal-offering but including the whole of the sacrifice. "*It was the name given to the Lamb that taketh away sins*"—such might have been the comment placed in the margin of the text "at the going up of the Minchah." What might be the consequences?

[**637**] The Biblical Hebrew "go up", being frequently confused with the New Hebrew "approach"[2], might be taken as the latter here, so as to give the sense "At his approach", *i.e.* "When Jesus came to him [John]."

---

[1] [**635** *b*] Resch, *Agr.* p. 358 "Der ist getauft worden und ist aufgestiegen aus der Mitte der Wasser, und aufgegangen ist sein Licht über die Erde."

[2] [**637** *a*] In the Bible, עלה, "go up", =(Tromm.) (4) "depart", *ἀπέρχομαι*: (5) "go", *πορεύομαι*: (5) "go out", *ἐξέρχομαι* &c. Besides other reasons, one may have been (occasionally) the Targum use (Levy, *Ch.* ii. 218) of עלל for "come" or "go". In some forms, e.g. עלו, the same letters might mean "they went up" or "they went", "entered" &c.

[638] "It was the name given to" might easily be confused with "He [John] gave him the name of"[1].

From these two confusions combined with the comment above mentioned might arise a reconstruction of the whole sentence thus: "When He approached he [John] called Him the Lamb that taketh away sins."

[639] On the whole, it is probable that Luke's and John's interpretations are nearest to the spirit of the Original, although those that mention "going up" are nearer to its letter. The intelligibility of Mark's and Matthew's tradition has given it predominance. But, though simple in itself, it raises this very difficult question, Why did Luke omit it? Moreover it explains none of the varying traditions. The hypothesis of what may be called an original "oblation-tradition" labours under what some may deem the insuperable objection that *it does not survive in any of the extant varying Christian narratives*. But is not the insuperability of this objection (on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original) disproved by facts? Take the Greek of Daniel or of Ben Sira, and suppose no Hebrew of either had ever been discovered. If a scholar were to attempt to return to the lost Hebrew in some passage from the varying versions and MSS., and were to submit to experts a conjecture that seemed to satisfy the phenomena, few would urge, as a fatal and final argument, "This reading is not found in any extant authority." If any did so, the discovery of the lost Hebrew would often refute them, shewing that it was the correct reading, and that it had been restored in the correct way, by tracing visible lines of evidence converging to an invisible centre.

[1] [638 *a*] Comp. 2 S. v. 9, 20 "he called", LXX "*was* called" = 1 Chr. xi. 7, xiv. 11 "they called"; 1 K. ix. 13 "and he called them" (marg. "they *were* called"); Is. xli. 25 "*calleth* upon my name," LXX "*shall be called* by my name"; Is. lxv. 1 "*was not called* by (marg. *hath not called* upon) my name."

CHAPTER V

THE RENDING OF THE HEAVENS

§ 1. "*Rending*", *or* "*opening*"?

[**640**] THE Synoptists have:—

Mk i. 10 (lit.).	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 21
"he-saw *in-the-act-of-being-rent* the heavens."	"and behold *there-were-opened* the heavens" (marg. "opened for him").	"but it came to pass that...*there-was-opened* the heaven."

Compare Jn i. 51 "Ye shall see the heaven *set open*[1]."

[**641**] The Bible elsewhere speaks of heaven being "opened", and of a "door" or "window" in heaven, but the verb "rend" is nowhere used in this connection except once by Isaiah (lxiv. 1—4) "Oh that thou wouldest *rend*[2] the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence; as when fire kindleth the brushwood [and] the fire causeth the waters to boil: to make thy name known to thine adversaries... For from of old men have

---

[1] [**640** *a*] "Set open," *ἀνεῳγότα*, the perf. particip., which suggests, not "opened for a moment," but "standing open".

[2] [**641** *a*] "Rend (קרע)" = *διαῤῥήγνυμι* (44) *διασχίζω* (1) *σχίζω* (1) &c. The only instance in which it = *ἀνοίγω* is Is. lxiv. 1. Probably the LXX thought that "open", not "rend", was the appropriate verb in connection with "heaven".

not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen a God beside thee, who worketh for him that waiteth for him." The prophet seems to be praying for a new and more glorious Sinai and a new and clearer Law. St Paul applies a portion of this prophecy (freely quoted) to the glorious revelation of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 8—10) "which none of the rulers of this world knoweth: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory: but, as it is written, *Things that eye saw not and ear heard not and that entered not into the heart of man—whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him:* But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit."

[**642**] That Mark's version is closer to the Original than that of Matthew and Luke, is probable for the following reasons. (1) The fact that the LXX in Isaiah (lxiv. 1) has wrongly translated "*rend* the heavens" by "*open* the heavens" shews that in N. T. there would be a similar tendency to alter the unusual into the usual term. (2) There is a special force about Mark, which is lost in the later Gospels. "Rend" does not mean the mere "opening" of a window or door—which may be speedily shut after being momentarily opened—but the permanent tearing open of a veil between God and man, so as to leave an outlet for a continuous stream of revelation such as St Paul goes on to speak of (1 Cor. ii. 10 "But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit"), and such as we might expect from the descent of the Spirit. (3) There is what may be called a psychological probability that a vision of this kind, based on prophecy realised through startling phenomena, would be seen by John the Baptist—a prophet somewhat resembling Elijah, and more likely to see the heavens "rent asunder" than "a door opened in heaven." (4) It may be objected that John, not indeed in the account of the Baptism but shortly afterwards, uses the word used by Matthew and Luke in a somewhat similar context (Jn i. 51) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall see the

heaven set open." But the perfect participle in John seems to denote something different from the past tenses of Matthew and Luke. Taken in conjunction with John's context about "angels ascending and descending," his words seem to promise a continuous revelation and a permanent avenue opened up between heaven and earth. Such a prediction by our Lord is not incompatible with the supposition that the Baptist may have seen a momentary and rudimentary vision in which the "veil" was rent asunder as a preparation for better things which he was not destined to see.

§ 2. *Why omitted by several authorities?*

[**643**] But why do Justin, the Nazarene Gospel, the Sibyl, the Jew in Celsus, and Ephrem (in his brief reference to the signs accompanying the Baptism, describing how Satan recognized the power of the new Prophet) make no mention either of a "rending" or of an "opening" of the heavens? Justin and the Sibyl do not even say that the dove came from "heaven". The former says that "as a dove the Holy Spirit alighted on him," and may possibly assume that his readers would understand that the Holy Spirit must needs "alight" from above. The same assumption may also underlie the Sybil's statement, "the spirit alighted upon him." But the Jew in Celsus not only omits mention of a rending of the heavens, but also uses the expression "You say that the phantom of a bird alighted on you from the *lower-air*," using the word *aer* apparently as distinct from *aether*, "upper air", or from "heaven".

[**644**] It happens that the word "rend" in Hebrew, קרע, is similar to the word "firmament", רקיע, differing by little more than transposition[1]. And whereas the "rending of the heavens" is but once mentioned in the Bible, "the firmament

[1] [**644** *a*] For a similar transposition see 2 K. xvii. 21 "he rent (קרע)", LXX "only" (leg. רק).

of the heaven" occurs four times in a single chapter of Genesis: and it would be very natural that "rend" should be corrupted into "firmament" if anything in the context suggested the latter. But the context introduces the descent of a dove. Now the very first mention of birds in Genesis (i. 20) connects them with "the *firmament*"; and in that passage the Jerusalem Targum alters it into "the *lower-air* of the firmament," using the very same word employed by the Jew in Celsus[1]. Later on, in Deuteronomy (iv. 17 "any winged fowl that flieth in the heaven"), both Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum have "in the *lower-air* of the firmament of the heaven." Having, then, in view the following mention of a "dove", and (possibly) controversies as to the precise heaven from which the dove flew, a Jewish evangelist might possibly substitute the easy "firmament" for the difficult "rend", so as to give, "And he beheld *the firmament of the heaven* and behold, a dove...." Another might substitute for this "the lower air", and this the Jew in Celsus might quote.

§ 3. *Who saw the vision?*

[**645**] The Synoptists have:—

Mk i. 10.	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 21.
"And straightway going up out of the water he" [prob. Jesus, but poss. John] "*saw* the heavens in the act of being rent."	"But having been baptized, Jesus straightway went up from the water, and, behold, the heavens *were* opened [marg. + *to him*]."	"But *it came to pass that*...when Jesus had been baptized and was in the act of praying, the heaven *was* opened."

[**646**] Compare Jn i. 32—3: "And John bare witness saying, *I have beheld* the Spirit descending..... he said to

[1] [644 *b*] For אוירא, Gk *ἀήρ*, see Levy, *Ch.* i. 15. In the constructive case אויר, by dropping *yod*, it would become אור = "light".

me, On whomsoever *thou shalt see* the Spirit descending...." [No mention of "heaven opened".]

[Later on, Jesus says to Nathanael (Jn i. 51) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *ye shall see* the heaven set open[1] and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man."]

[**647**] Of the narratives given in the Appendix, only the Ebionite Gospel and the Testament of the Patriarchs mention the "opening", and neither of these inserts "to him".

[**648**] The parallelism between (Mark) "saw", (Matthew) "behold!" and (Luke) "it came to pass," leads us to seek in the first place some Hebrew word that might be confused so as to give rise to these three renderings; and the stress laid by John on the "beholding", or "seeing", of the Baptist (though it refers here to the descent of the Spirit, and not to the opening of the heavens, which is not mentioned till later on, and apart from the Baptist) suggests that "see", perhaps in the sense of seeing a vision, was the original word. Many Christian controversialists must have felt the force of the Jew's argument in Celsus, when he asks *Who saw the dove* (except Jesus and His companion)? Chrysostom, at all events, assumes that *all the miraculous phenomena of the Baptism were perceived by the senses of the by-standers*; and he meets the question, "Why then were they not convinced?" by pointing to Israel in the Wilderness, surrounded by signs

[1] [**646***a*] "Set open (*ἀνεῳγότα*)." The perf. part., in Jn at all events, is generally used to denote completeness and sometimes permanence. Here it may be used in contrast to the present participle of Mk's tradition about a sudden "rending asunder", confused by some with a transitory "opening" (see above **642**). Comp. Acts vii. 56 "I behold the heavens *thrown-open*, or *opened-wide* (*διηνοιγμένους*)"—perhaps permanently, for Stephen. The meaning however would depend upon the context. Permanence is implied in Rev. iii. 8, but not in Acts x. 11.

For a variation between the perf. and pres. participle, compare:

Mk ix. 1 (lit.).	Mt. xvi. 28.	Lk. ix. 27.
"The Kingdom of God *having-permanently-come* (*ἐληλυθῦαν*) in power."	"The Son of man *in-the-act-of-coming* (*ἐρχόμενον*) in his kingdom."	"The Kingdom of God."

and miracles quite as wonderful, yet constantly breaking out into unbelief. The desire for some objective proof was so natural that we cannot be surprised if Matthew and Luke availed themselves of any obscurity in the Hebrew Original to take the narrative out of the category of a vision: as indeed they both do, but Luke even more thoroughly than Matthew. In Mark, the rending of the heavens and the descent of the Spirit are both "seen". In Matthew, one of these phenomena is "seen", the other is a fact. In Luke, both are facts.

[649] Returning, then, to the hypothesis of a Hebrew Original, we find a considerable similarity between "see" (חזה), "behold!" (הנה), and "it came to pass" (היה). These words are confused in the LXX[1]: and the phenomena are satisfied by the hypothesis that Mark read the first, Matthew the second, and Luke the third[2].

[650] How does John deal with these variations? He sides with Mark in using the word "see" or "behold", but he differs from all the Synoptists by converting their Evangelistic statement about what *some one saw* (or, according to Luke, what "*came to pass*") into a statement *made by the Baptist about what he himself saw.* Moreover, the Baptist, in John, adds that God warned him beforehand that he would see the descent of the Spirit (not however including any "rending" of the heavens). Thus the Johannine account is compatible with a spiritual Voice and an invisible descent of the Spirit, such as most would admit to be intended in the anointing of David by Samuel (1 S. xvi. 12—13) "And

[1] [649 *a*] In Isaiah ii. 1, חזה "see", is rendered "become" (leg. היה), and comp. Job viii. 17, where חזה is read as חיה, which differs little from היה.

The LXX substitutes "came to pass" (היה) for "behold" (הנה) in Is. lix. 9; Ezek. xxxiii. 32; and Hagg. i. 9.

[2] [649 *b*] Of course, conflation may also have been at work, so that "he saw" may have been conflated with "behold!".

the Lord said, Arise, anoint him: for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and *the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward.*"

[**651**] Mark, whose history deals rather with deeds than with words, may have taken the Baptist's statement, "*I* saw", as the basis for his own historical statement of fact, "*he* saw", where "he" may have originally meant the Baptist. But it is also possible that Mark may have mistaken an utterance of the Baptist's ("I saw", ΕΙΔΟΝ) for a statement of fact ("he saw", ΕΙΔΕΝ) owing to the similarity of Ε and Ο, which are frequently confused. The substance of Mark's original may have been a mixture of the Baptist's speech and parenthetical statement of fact, which, by doing little more than reading Ε for Ο, Mark might convert into "Now in those days Jesus came to John and was baptized, *and he saw* the Spirit as a dove descending on him[1]." This would naturally be amplified by inserting a statement of the baptism as a fact, and of some of its details, *e.g.* the opening of the heavens.

[**652**] Our conclusion is that Mark is probably more correct than Matthew and Luke in using "he saw" instead

---

[1] [**651** *a*] The Original Greek translation might be to this effect:

Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου...Ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ—οὗτος δὲ ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐρχόμενος πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάνην καὶ βαπτιζόμενος—καὶ ΕΙΔΟΝ *τὸ πνεῦμα,* "There cometh after me, *i.e.* There is among my followers, one stronger than I..... I baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit—this was Jesus who in those days came to John and was baptized—and *I saw* (ΕΙΔΟΝ) the Spirit....."

By simply reading ΕΙΔΕΝ for ΕΙΔΟΝ and punctuating differently, this might be rendered, without much error, "Now this Jesus came in those days and was baptized and he saw the Spirit....."

[**651** *b*] It should be noted that "cometh after me", if interpreted, as it well might be, "is one of my followers or disciples," would harmonize well with the words of the Fourth Gospel, "*There standeth one among you* whom you know not," *i.e.* Jesus had *already come* to the Baptist, but was still, in Hebrew idiom, "coming after him", *i.e.* following him.

of "behold!" or "it came to pass." Putting aside, for the time, the details of the vision, we may say that John may be still more correct in using "*I* saw" where Mark has "he saw", and in representing the seer as being John the Baptist.

§ 4. (Jn i. 51) "*The heaven set-open*"

[**653**] In the Fourth Gospel the first words uttered by Jesus are (Jn i. 38) "What seek ye?"—addressed to *future* converts. But the first utterance to *disciples* collectively is (Jn i. 50–1)[1] "'*Thou* shalt see greater things than these.' And he saith unto *him*, 'Verily, verily, I say unto *you*, *Ye shall see the heaven set open* and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man'."

[**654**] According to Chrysostom, and some passages of Epiphanius, the "open heaven", the descending dove, and the Voice proclaiming the Son of God, had already been witnessed by the Baptist and his followers, two of whom, at least, are here addressed. John, however, manifestly regards the disciples as not yet having witnessed any "opening" of the heaven. It is as though the Evangelist were tacitly protecting his readers against any erroneous or exaggerated impressions derivable from the Synoptists, indicating that, whatever might have been revealed to the Baptist, the revelation for the disciples at all events was still to come. Considering that the "opening of the heavens" is mentioned but *once* in the Three Gospels, and but *once* in the Fourth, and *in both cases at the very outset of Christ's career*, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that John wrote with a distinct reference to the Synoptic parallel.

[**655**] The Johannine passage mentions "angels of God" in connection with "the Son of man." Mark also and Matthew,

[1] It begins as though addressed to Nathanael, the "Israelite without guile", but passes on to include the whole of the small congregation, five or six in number.

after the Baptism and the Temptation, on introducing the public life of Jesus, mention "angels" as "ministering" to Him. Luke omits this. This is all the more remarkable because a very early tradition in the Epistle to the Hebrews has (i. 6) "And again when he bringeth the First-born into the world, he saith, *And let all the angels of God worship him*," which might be taken by some as referring to the beginning of Christ's public career. So, too, might the ancient hymn (1 Tim. iii. 16) "Manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, *appeared unto angels*, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory[1]."

[**656**] In almost every case where Luke omits or entirely alters an important statement of Mark, it has been shewn that John intervenes to clear up some obscurity or corruption[2]. Now that there is some corruption here in the Synoptic Tradition is indicated by the context, because Mark goes on to mention the first words of Jesus as "The *season* is fulfilled, and *the Kingdom of God hath drawn near*"; Matthew, "*From that season* (lit. *from then*) began Jesus to preach '..... for *the kingdom of the heavens hath drawn near*'." But Luke has nothing of this except the word "season" in the preceding verse, "the devil departed from him for (or, until) *a season*." Without entering into details, it may be pointed out that in the context—that is, on the border line between the Baptism and the Temptation—there occur the words "angel", "fulfil", "kingdom", and that these words are extremely liable to be confused[3]. Also the Psalm on which

[1] Comp. Clem. Alex. (973) "The Saviour appeared, when coming down [from heaven at the Nativity] to angels."

[2] *Enc. B.*, GOSPELS, 1768–9.

[3] [**656** *a*] "Angel" = מלאך, "fulfil" = מלא, "kingdom" = מלכה. As 1st cent. MSS. probably made no distinction between *Caph* medial and final, "kingdom" might easily be confused with "king" מלך, and this is confused with מלאך "angel", or "messenger", at least 6 times in O.T., either by the LXX or by the Hebrew text (see especially 2 S. xi. 1 Heb.

the writer to the Hebrews, following the LXX, seems to have based his quotation about "*angels*" (Ps. xcvii. 7 (R. V.), "Worship him" (lit. "fall down, or crouch, to him") "all [ye] *gods*") was interpreted by the Jews "all the *false gods* shall *fall down* [*in fear*] before him[1]."

[**657**] This points to the paradoxical conclusion that one and the same Hebrew tradition might originate two totally opposite traditions in Greek Gospels: (1) "*Angels of God* fell down in worship and ministration before Messiah," (2) "*Angels of Satan* fell down in fear before Messiah [and departed from Him]."

[**658**] "Angels", in the undefined plural, is certainly used in a bad sense where St Paul speaks of "judging *angels*", and probably elsewhere, "We were made a spectacle to *the world* —both *angels* and *men*[2]." The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy perhaps takes as its basis the Jewish interpretation of the Psalm above-mentioned ("all *false gods* shall *fall down* before him") in a story placed immediately after the arrival of the Child Jesus in Egypt, (§ 10—11) "that *idol fell down* ..... the *idol* was broken and all the *gods fell*[3]."

[**659**] As an instance of Jewish oscillation between the good and the bad meaning of "angels" take the Jerusalem Targum (I) in the story of Jacob's Ladder, where one might have supposed that ambiguity was excluded by the term (a

---

"messengers"; 2 K. vii. 17 Heb. "king", but LXX and Syriac rightly "messenger" (Ginsburg)). I have found only one instance of confusion of forms of מלא and מלאך, Exod. xxxi. 5; but it might easily occur. In Sirach xlviii. 8 "filled", מלא, = LXX "kings", fr. מלך.

[1] See j. Aboda Zara iv. 7 (Schwab xi. 228) and see Biesenthal on Heb. i. 6.

[2] 1 Cor. vi. 3, iv. 9, possibly also in xi. 10 *τοὺς ἀ.*, Rom. viii. 38. After the Temptation, Mk inserts the article, but Mt. omits it.

[3] The Psalmist mentions "images" as well as "gods" (Ps. xcvii. 7) "Ashamed be all they that serve *graven images*, that boast themselves of *idols*; fall down before him, all [ye] *gods*."

very rare one) "angels *of God*"[1]. The Targumist has "The two angels who went unto Sedom (*i.e.* Sodom) and *who had been expelled from the midst of them* .. ... ascended to the high heavens and said, Come, see Jacob the pious whose likeness is inlaid in the throne of glory and whom you have so greatly desired to behold[2]. Then the rest of the *angels of the holy Lord* descended to look upon him." The second Targum, though briefer, makes a similar distinction between angels who accompany Jacob on earth and "angels on high" who are "desirous to see" the likeness of God in man[3]. Both Targums curiously illustrate the saying in the First Epistle of Peter, that "the angels desire to look into" the mystery of man's redemption by God.

[**660**] If we ask what Synoptic promise corresponds—not indeed verbally, but spiritually and essentially—to this Johannine promise ("Ye shall see ..... the angels"), we may find one answer in the words recorded with slight variations by the three Synoptists, "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God[4]." But how differently this glorious revelation of the Kingdom of God might be expressed

---

[1] [**659** *a*] In O.T. the English Concordance gives the plural "angels of God" only in Gen. xxviii. 12, xxxii. 1, describing Jacob's Ladder and Jacob at Mahanaim.

[2] [**659** *b*] Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12 "which things angels desire to look into."

[3] [**659** *c*] Hershon, *Genes. Talm.*, ad loc., says, but without ref. "The angels, filled with envy at the exact resemblance between the face of Jacob and the human face of the figure in God's throne, were *about to injure Jacob*, and, behold, the Lord stood above him." Levy i. 139 *a* quotes Genes. r. s. 68, 68 *b* "The angels hopped round him, sprang round him, teased (neckten) him," but explains it as meaning "in order to shew their *joy*." Some said (*ib.* iii. 533 *a*) the angels stepped on "the *ladder*", others said, "on *Jacob*".

[4] Mk iv. 11; Mt. xiii. 11; Lk. viii. 10. In Mt. (xiii. 16), this is followed by a statement that many "*prophets and righteous men*" (Lk. x. 24 "*prophets and kings*") have "desired to see" these mysteries; and reasons have been given (**272** (i)) for thinking that the Original was "*prophets and messengers* (or, *angels*) *of God*."

in three early Greek Gospels is seen from the three following versions of Christ's Promise before the Transfiguration:

Mk ix. 1.	Mt. xvi. 28.	Lk. ix. 27.
"...until they see *the kingdom of God when-it-hath-come in power.*"	"...until they see *the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*"	"...until they see *the kingdom of God.*"

A fourth version is given by Clement A. (967): "until they see the Son of man *in glory*[1]."

[**661**] Returning to the Johannine promise we seem justified in the inference that this beautiful allusion to Jacob's revelation may approximately represent—and perhaps more closely than do the Synoptists—the early teaching of Christ to His disciples. Nathanael wishes to give Him the title of "Son of *God*"—simply because Jesus has read his thoughts under the fig-tree! Jesus tells him, in effect, that he must begin from "the Son of *man*". On the Son of *man* as on a ladder to heaven they may see the angels of God ascending and descending: (Ps. lxxxv. 10) "Grace (R. V. "*mercy*") and

[1] [**660** *a*] Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται, where several authorities (W.H.) add "*and power*", καὶ δυνάμεως, after "*glory*". Others insert "name", ὄνομα, for, or in combination with, "spirit", πνεῦμα (see below (**968**) for Marcion's reading of "*spirit*" in the clause "Hallowed be thy *name*"). In 1 Pet. this substitution of "name" seems to have led several MSS. to insert a gloss to explain "the *name* of *glory* and of God" thus, "though it is blasphemed in others it is *glorified* in you."

The Jewish habit of expressing "God" by "Glory", "Heaven", "Name", and other periphrases, may explain many corruptions of text, even in the Epistles. For, though not translated from Aramaic or Hebrew, they may have been, at least in some cases, *thought* in Aramaic, *e.g.* "the *riches* of his *glory*," "an eternal *weight* of *glory*." The same Biblical Hebrew root (כבד) originates "weight", "riches", and "glory", and it is habitually altered in the Targums to a word meaning "precious" (see **915** *a*). Later on, we shall find (**899**) the LXX actually rendering the "*goodness*" of God by "*glory*".

truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth springeth out of the earth and righteousness hath looked down from heaven." Beginning from this revelation they will rise upward to the stage where they can bear to hear from the Son of man, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." For the present—so the Evangelist seems to say—it was enough for the disciples to know that this was the true "opening of the heavens," and to fasten their gaze on the spiritual glory of grace and truth, casting aside old Essene stories about the names of angels, good or bad, and discordant legends about their relations with Jesus[1].

[1] [661 *a*] See 907, for John's conception of "glory" as affecting his attitude toward the Synoptic narrative. For a fuller investigation into the textual origin of Jn i. 51, it would be necessary to examine all Evangelic passages mentioning angels, in which there are curious differences. It is not contended that the words "heaven set open" are based on any *parallel* Synoptic tradition. They appear to look *back* to the Baptism, as much as to say, "That was not the 'opening of heaven' for the Church, whatever it may have been for the Baptist." An Evangelist might very well argue thus: "Samuel did not see the heaven open when he anointed David and when the Spirit descended on the youth. In many of the Churches in the West, people take this statement about the opening of the heaven as though a material window were made visibly open to a number of spectators. I will not say, 'It was *not* opened.' But I will say that Jesus spoke of the 'opening' as *future*."

CHAPTER VI

THE DESCENT OF THE SPIRIT

§ 1. *What descended?*

[**662**] THE Canonical Gospels have:

Mk i. 10.	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 22.	Jn i. 32–3.
"The *Spirit*"	"[The] *Spirit of God*"	"The *Holy Spirit in a bodily form*"	"The *Spirit*... the *Spirit*"

The reader must note the omission of "the" before "Spirit" in Matthew ("[the] Spirit of God") in order to be prepared for some perplexing variations in Greek translations from Hebrew that will be presented to him in the forthcoming section.

[**663**] Unfortunately it is the Hebrew custom to drop "the" (-ה) before a noun when that noun is defined by a genitive. Thus "*the* angel," *when standing by itself*, is defined by -ה, before "angel"; but, in "*the* angel of [the] Lord" (lit. "angel of Jehovah"), -ה is dropped, and *there is actually nothing in the Hebrew* WORDS *to tell us whether the writer means* "*the* angel of the Lord," or "*an* angel of the Lord." The sole guide is Hebrew *thought*. In Judg. ii. 1, vi. 11, 22, xiii. 16, 21, where A.V. has "*an* angel of the Lord," R.V. has "*the* angel of the Lord." But R.V., in Judg. ii. 1, gives a

marginal alternative "*a* messenger of the Lord." Generally, *in O.T.*, R.V. goes on the principle that *the Hebrew "angel of the Lord, or, of God" is definite*, except where a heathen (who might be supposed to believe in many angels) is speaking, *e.g.* Achish (1 S. xxix. 9)[1]. On the other hand in N.T., when the Greek writers adopt the indefinite "[the] angel of [the] Lord", the R.V. goes on the principle that the meaning is "an angel of the Lord," because the Jews of Christ's time believed in a plurality of angels so that no single one would be by them called "*the* angel".

[**664**] Theoretically the same ambiguity might apply to "[the] *spirit of* God", or "[the] *spirit of* [the] Lord (or, of Jehovah)", as to "[the] *angel of* [the] Lord". But in practice it does not, for this reason, that a belief in a plurality of "spirits of the Lord" never became so general as a belief in "angels of the Lord." Nevertheless there was an early Christian belief in the existence of "*seven* spirits of God," and it happens to be connected with the very passage in Isaiah that we have been, and shall be, discussing, which describes the Spirit resting on Messiah. The reader must therefore be prepared to find in the LXX diversities of rendering the Hebrew "[the] spirit of [the] Lord", and it will be maintained in this section that this phrase was in Mark's original and was—at least in part—the cause of the Evangelic and the non-evangelic divergences. The latter are given below.

[**665**] Justin, Ephrem, the Arabic Diatessaron, and Epiphanius[2], have "the *Holy Spirit*".

The Ebionite Gospel, conflating as usual, has "the *Holy Spirit of God.*"

[1] In 2 S. xix. 27, xiv. 17, 20 R.V. has txt. "an", marg. "the".

[2] [**665** *a*] Epiphanius above (see **591**), when quoting Luke, has "*the Holy* Spirit", but immediately afterwards (when quoting Matthew perhaps) he has simply "*the* Spirit". Writing in his own name, he has in the context, 1st, "the Father and *the* Spirit," 2nd, "the Father and *the Holy* Spirit." A Christian writer might, of course, use either phrase (see below **672**).

The Nazarene Gospel, "the *whole fountain of the Holy Spirit.*"

The Testament of the XII Patriarchs, "*Consecration*...the *Spirit of understanding and consecration.*"

Cerinthus (Iren. i. 26. 1) "*Christ* descended upon Him [*i.e.* upon Jesus] in the form of a dove."

Compare Coloss. ii. 9 "In him dwelleth *all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*[1]," and *ib.* i. 19 "It was the good pleasure [of the Father] that in him should *all the fulness* dwell."

The Sibyl mentions "the Spirit", but as "alighting (or, flying)" not as "descending".

Celsus also mentions only "alighting (or, flying)", no "descending". But, further, he makes no mention of "Spirit".

[**666**] Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian all connect the descent of the Spirit at our Lord's baptism with the prophecy of Isaiah xi. 2 "And there shall rest upon him the Spirit of the Lord." The prophet proceeds to enumerate three pairs of "spirits" (or, as Justin calls them, "powers of the Spirit") as follows, "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." Then follow the obscure words (R.V. text) "*And his delight shall be* (R.V. marg. *And he shall be of quick understanding*) in the fear of the Lord": but these the LXX renders "And *the spirit* of the fear of God *shall fill him,*" thus introducing a seventh spirit, and also the word "fill" which is not in the Hebrew text[2]. Irenaeus quotes

[1] [**665** *b*] The word "bodily" occurs in N.T. only in these two passages and 1 Tim. iv. 8 ("bodily exercise"). The rarity of the word and the similarity of the thought make it highly probable that the Colossian phrases refer to some tradition like Luke's about the Baptism of Christ.

[2] [**666** *a*] Is. xi. 3 (R.V.) "And *his delight shall be* (והריחו)," ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα. *Sanhedr.* 93[b] indicates early difference of opinion (see **667**) as to the meaning, one Rabbi even suggesting "mill-stones", ריחיים. A comparison of Ezek. xxiv. 13 (R.V.) "*satisfied* (marg. *brought to rest*) (הניח)," ἐμπλήσω, suggests that here the LXX conflated the word as הניח ("fill") and הרוח ("the spirit"). In Habak. ii. 5 ינוה (which might easily

the same version of the same prophecy, and he likens the Spirit to "voluntary rain from above" or "the water from heaven," which approaches the language of the Nazarene Gospel[1]. Tertullian goes a step further by connecting the prophecy with the terms "fulness (plenitudo) of the Spirit" "completeness (universitas) of spiritual signs," "total substance of the Spirit[2]." Lastly, about the middle of the third century, Novatian quotes it as shewing that the Spirit "came and abode upon Him dwelling in Christ full and entire...with its whole overflow copiously distributed.....the source of the entire Holy Spirit remaining in Christ so that from Him might be drawn streams of gifts and works[3]." This combines the Nazarene metaphor with the Tertullian insistence on "fulness" or "completeness".

[667] In Justin, the prophecy of Isaiah is quoted not by Justin himself but by Trypho the Jew, who assumes that the Christians will apply it to their Messiah, and asks how he can possibly be divine since he "needs" all these "spirits" to rest upon him? The Babylonian Talmud confirms the Messianic application. Quoting the clause that follows the "resting" of the six "spirits" (rendered by R.V. text "his delight shall be") the Talmud renders it "he shall have [a]

be confused with ינוח) (Gesen. 627 *b*) "We. prop. ירוה, be satiated." But if "I rest" may mean "I am satisfied", "I am filled", then the opening words of Is. xi. 2 "There shall *rest* upon him the Spirit" might be interpreted "There shall be *satisfied*, or *filled*, the Spirit upon him," and this, of itself, might originate a tradition about "*the fulness* of the Spirit."

[1] [666 *b*] Irenaeus (iii. 9. 3) "He was anointed by the Father [with] the Spirit...as also Isaiah says (xi. 1—3) 'There shall go forth a rod...' (as LXX)," and again (iii. 17. 3) where the descending Spirit is likened to "dew" or "water from heaven". But his quotation, like Tertullian's, is not consistent. For in iii. 17. 3, "the spirit of the fear of the Lord," he omits "fill" (in Is. xi. 3 (LXX)).

[2] Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* ix. (ins. "fill"), *Marc.* iii. 17 (om. "fill"), *Marc.* v. 8 (ins. "fill").

[3] Novatian (Clark's *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. xiii. p. 373) *De Trin.* § 29.

keen scent," *i.e.* he shall judge, not according to appearance, but with an instinctive power of judgment. Then it continues, "Bar-Kochba reigned two years and a half. He said to the Rabbis, 'I am Messiah'. They said to him, 'Concerning Messiah, it is written that He *hath-scent* and judgeth [thereafter].....'. When they saw that he did not *have-scent* and judge [thereafter] they slew him[1]." Bar-Kochba's want of "scent", or discernment in judging, is explained by the Jerusalem Talmud which, without referring to Isaiah, tells us that Bar-Kochba put his own uncle to death being deceived by the misrepresentations of a Samaritan, and a Voice from Heaven condemned him[2]. Bar-Kochba's short "reign", or rebellion, ended about 135 A.D., some 15 years before Justin wrote[3]. These traditions indicate that the Isaiah passage would be accepted by Jews, as well as Christians, as a prediction of the resting of the "spirits" of God upon the Messiah. The former, doubtless, would place Jesus on the same level as Bar-Kochba. Both, they would say, were deceivers: neither of them had the power of judging with discernment: on neither had the spirits really rested.

[668] The evidence now extant proves only that controversies of this kind were rife in the time of Justin. But they must have begun as soon as Jews and Christians began to dispute as to the "resting" of the "spirits" on Christ. For the LXX committed Christians to "seven" spirits; but the Hebrew text mentions only six, and the Babylonian Talmud emphasizes the number in connection with six descendants

[1] [667 *a*] *Sanh.* 93[b] (ed. Goldschmidt) "they *slew* him (קטלוה)", "*toteten* sie ihn". Rodkinson, whose text here differs widely from that of Goldschmidt, has, "Hence, if not by the eye and not by the ear it must be by smelling; and therefore the sages *did not recognize* Bar Kochba." Possibly the meaning is "THEY slew" (738), *i.e.* the powers of heaven. He was not executed by "the Rabbis", but fell in battle against the Romans.

[2] J. *Taanith*, iv. 5 (6), Schwab, vi. 189.

[3] Schürer, I. ii. 311.

from Ruth (iii. 17 "six barleys") and six blessings on the companions of Daniel (i. 4)[1]—not improbably having in view the Christian error as to "seven spirits" which is found as early as the Book of Revelation, but has not yet been paralleled by any Jewish tradition[2]. Thus it appears probable from many points of view that the earliest preaching and

[1] *Sanhedr.* 93[b]. Rodkinson (p. 283) after quoting Dan. i. 4 adds in brackets "Hence all of them were blessed with six things." This is not in the Heb. as given by Goldschmidt.

[2] [668 *a*] The only mentions of "seven spirits" in the Bible are Rev. i. 4 "*The seven spirits* that are before the throne," *ib.* iii. 1 "*the seven spirits of God* and the seven stars," *ib.* iv. 5 "seven lamps...before the throne, which are the *seven spirits of God*," *ib.* v. 6 "seven eyes which are the [seven] spirits of God." Wetstein and Schöttgen adduce no instances of the phrase in Jewish tradition, and we have seen that the Talmud, in its comment on Isaiah (xi. 2), insists on the number as being "six". Schöttgen (ii. 269, 277, 332, 362) quotes several late Jewish traditions (some probably medieval) about "four" spirits, or winds, but only in one (*ib.* 362) does a late tradition make Isaiah's six spirits into "seven" by taking "the Spirit of the Lord" as one of the seven. Wetstein refers to Tob. xii. 15 ("the seven angels that go in before the glory of the Holy One") and Targ. Jer. on Genes. xi. 7. But the latter speaks of the *seventy* angels that correspond to the seventy nations of the earth: and the former does not suffice to prove that "the seven spirits" came from a Jewish source. Possibly the author of the Apocalypse derived his "seven spirits" from meditation on Zech. iv. 2—10 "seven *lamps*...by my *spirit*...these *seven* which are the *eyes* of the Lord," with an infusion of Eastern tradition about seven angels before the throne, and Western tradition, just then entering the Church, erroneously finding seven spirits in Isaiah. The first patristic reference that I have found to seven spirits is in Tertullian's *Antitheta*, iv. 167 where he connects them with the lamps in the Tabernacle. Hippolytus, Victorinus, and Methodius connect the phrase with Isaiah xi. 1—2.

[668 *b*] In Orac. Sibyll. vii. 67 instead of "*there alighted* the spirit," two MSS. have "seven", reading *επταο* as though it were *επτα το*. The thought suggests itself that some Greek corruption of this kind—amid conflicting traditions about "the spirit", "the Spirit of God," "the fulness of the Spirit," "the seven spirits"—may have originated the tradition about "flying" adopted by Celsus and the Sibyl instead of "going down". It must be added, however, that in Nahum (iii. 7), ירוד "fly" = LXX "go down" (leg. ירד), so that Hebrew corruption (together with the nature of the context) might explain the interchange.

writing about the descent of the Spirit on Christ would be based upon the prophecy of Isaiah, and that controversies about the prophetic meaning would be likely to modify the evangelic texts.

[**669**] Returning then to the evangelic differences (Mk and Jn) "the Spirit", (Mt.) "[the] Spirit of God", (Lk.) "the Holy Spirit in a bodily form", we have to ask whether the Hebrew or the Greek of Isaiah, or controversies arising out of it, may have caused these divergences. The Hebrew begins "And there shall rest upon him [*the*] *Spirit of the Lord.*" But this is rendered by the LXX *in a manner unprecedented in O.T.*, "And there shall rest upon him [*a*] *spirit of the God.*" Not improbably the text is corrupt and the translators wished to say "the very Spirit of God," or "the Spirit of God Himself": but the Greek words imply the opposite of this, not definiteness, but indefiniteness—"*a* spirit of God[1]." The Greek is altered in Justin's text, but retained by Origen in his comment on John. Epiphanius misquotes the whole[2]. It is clear that similar early differences as to the Greek text of

[1] [**669** *a*] Is. xi. 2 πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Q. om. τοῦ, Q. mg. hab.). The Heb. "[the] Spirit of God"=πνεῦμα θεοῦ with occasional variations of π. θεῖον, κυρίου &c., but nowhere πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. As a rule, where the article is ins. before a genitive noun, but not before the noun governing that genitive, the latter is indefinite in N.T. Possibly ΤΟΥ is a corruption of ΚΥ "the Lord", a correction of "God" (the Heb. having "the Lord"). Or some doctrinal motive may have been at work. In Exod. xxxiii. 14, 15 "my FACE", "thy FACE", is rendered by LXX ΑΥΤΟC *i.e.* HE or SELF, and in Is. lxiii. 9 "*The angel of his FACE* saved them," LXX has "*No ambassador* or *angel but HIMSELF.*" If therefore the LXX wished to express the SPIRIT, including all the following "spirits", they may have had πνευμααυτοθεου "the *very* Spirit of God": and *a* being dropped after *a*, it would be inevitable to take υτο as an error for του.

[2] [**669** *b*] Epiph. *Laud. Mariae* (Petav. ii. 291 D) Is. xi. 2, LXX "and there shall rest upon *him* (αὐτόν) the Spirit of God," Epiph. "and there shall rest upon *her* (αὐτήν) the Spirit of the fear of God," or Epiph. may mean "*that* (root)", referring to ῥίζης just mentioned. But he apparently takes the "root" to be Mary, so that the pronoun, however translated, refers to her.

this Messianic passage, combined with a more or less faint sense that Jews disputed the accuracy of the Greek, might induce Evangelists in the first century to adopt different expressions.

[670] It might be thought an obvious course that Evangelists should translate the Hebrew literally, "[the] Spirit of [the] Lord": but this would not differentiate Christ from the Judges of Israel upon whom "the Spirit of the Lord" is said to have been[1]. Another course open was to adopt the LXX in the form in which Justin adopts it, omitting the objectionable word that gave it an indefinite meaning. This course is adopted by Matthew who has "Spirit of God". This phrase has the advantage of suggesting a parallel between the present passage and the Creation where "the Spirit of God" is said to have moved upon the face of the waters: but it has the disadvantage of being applied to Bezaleel, Balaam, and even to the messengers of Saul, meaning a spirit of artistic inspiration, or a spirit of ecstatic prophecy. Neither of these meanings could be applied to the term Holy Spirit, which Luke employs: but even as to that, converts might ask, perhaps wrongly but at least naturally, "Does not the Holy Spirit descend upon all converts, and can it be supposed that its descent on our Lord was similar—so far as the invisible and spiritual act was concerned—to its descent on us?".

[671] John may have objected to Matthew's "Spirit of God" for the very reason for which it may have commended itself to those who desired to see in the Baptism a parallel to the Creation: for according to John *the New Creation did not begin till after the Resurrection*, when (xx. 22) "Jesus breathed on them and said, Receive ye [the] Holy Spirit." For a somewhat similar reason he may have disliked Luke's phrase ("the Holy Spirit") as being premature. It was

[1] [670 *a*] Judg. iii. 10 (lit.) "The Spirit of the Lord *was* upon him" (R.V. "came") *i.e.* on Othniel. Comp. *ib.* vi. 34, xi. 29, xiii. 25, xiv. 6 &c.; 1 S. x. 6, xvi. 14. It often comes and goes fitfully.

correct—he might think—that the Baptist should say "He *will* baptize you with the Holy Spirit," looking forward to the future. But to say that the prophet *saw* "the Holy Spirit", even in a vision, might seem to John an anticipation of a revelation higher than the one vouchsafed to the Baptist, as though it meant "the Spirit—revealed in its attribute of Holiness, *which was manifested after the Resurrection.*"

[**672**] These reasons may have induced John to go back to the earliest of the three Synoptic traditions, which simply mentions "the Spirit". A Jew could hardly have used this phrase to denote "the Spirit of the Lord", or "the Spirit of God", or "the Holy Spirit"[1]. But this made it all the more suitable for distinctive use among Christians, to whom the frequent mention of "the Holy Spirit", and its combination with "the Father" and "the Son" had caused the abbreviated title of "the Spirit" to be familiar in all the Churches. Besides brevity, it had the merit of definiteness as being "*the* Spirit". It might also be said to be inclusive; for it included all that was good—not only holiness but also righteousness (which John appears (Jn xvii. 11, 25) to place as a climax above holiness), and not only righteousness but also knowledge and wisdom—all the "powers", or "spirits", be they six (as the Jews said) or seven (as the Christians said) mentioned by Isaiah. Doubtless John the Baptist could not possibly have said to his disciples "I have seen *the Spirit* descend"; nor could he (apart from incredible and needless miracle) have heard from God the words "Upon whomsoever thou shalt see *the Spirit* descend." According to the strict

[1] [**672** *a*] Buhl (766 *a*) gives only Num. xxvii. 18 "a man in whom is *spirit*," and Hos. ix. 7 "the prophet is a fool, the man of *the spirit* is mad." In the former, as the man, "Joshua", has not yet had the hands of Moses laid upon him, "spirit" may mean something different from the Spirit of God; in the latter there may be a play on the double meaning, "spirit" and "wind" (*i.e.* "empty babble"). Perhaps we should add 1 Chr. xii. 18 (lit.) "then spirit [? afflatus] clothed, *i.e.* fell upon, Amasai."

letter, therefore, we must pronounce the Fourth Gospel inaccurate in attributing these words to the Baptist. Doubtless also the Voices from Heaven that will be found below (**734–5**) recorded to have been uttered about Hillel and Samuel the Little in, or near, the times of Christ, mentioned "Holy Spirit", as the regular term distinguishing the divine power of a successor of the old prophets. But it by no means follows that the term was used here, even if we suppose the actual language of John the Baptist to have been recorded; for the message of God may have been, "On whomsoever thou shalt see *my spirit* descend," and the Baptist may have testified, "I beheld *His Spirit* (or, *the Spirit* [*above mentioned*]) descend and it abode on him[1]."

[**673**] Of the three Synoptic versions and their several claims to represent, or approximate to, the Original, we may safely say that Luke's ("the Holy Spirit") is the most improbable, as it is the phrase that any ordinary Jewish Christian would naturally have employed without a full understanding of the circumstances; and it could not possibly have been rejected by Mark—who is a plain, simple, and prosaic interpreter, wholly incapable of being influenced by the subtle spiritual considerations that might modify the Fourth Gospel. For a similar reason we may put aside Matthew's "Spirit of God" as being, though inadequate, not so inadequate as to be altered by Mark if he had received it from tradition.

[**674**] There remains, of course, a possibility that some rare expression, not now extant in any of the Gospels, may have been corrupted into their divergent readings, *e.g.* "the

[1] [**672** *b*] Comp. Is. xlii. 1 "I will put *my spirit* upon him" (quoted in Mt. xii. 18), Joel ii. 28 "*my spirit*" (quoted in Acts ii. 17) and the rarer phrase "*his spirit*" in Numb. xi. 29 "that the Lord would put *his Spirit* upon them," and note that in B. Sira (xlviii. 12) "Elisha was filled with *his* (Elijah's) spirit," "his (αὐτοῦ) spirit" is corrupted into "*holy* (ἁγίου) spirit" by A.

In Numb. xi. 25—30 "*when the spirit...his spirit*," Onk. and Jer. Targ. have "*the spirit of prophecy*."

Spirit in fulness[1]." But no hypothesis of that kind so completely satisfies all the phenomena as that which refers all the divergences, canonical and uncanonical, to Isaiah's prediction concerning the "spirits" that were to "rest" on the Messiah[2].

[675] In that passage we find in the first place a phrase, "[the] Spirit of the Lord," that suits the circumstances of the Baptism. In the next place, we find the LXX not only mistranslating it there in a very exceptional way, but also mistranslating or omitting it on every one of the six occasions on which it occurs in Isaiah[3]. Moreover we find the LXX introducing a phrase connecting "*fill*" with "spirit", which is either mentioned or implied in a long series of Christian traditions referring to the Baptism. We also find the passage actually put into the mouth of a Jew by a Christian, writing in the middle of the second century, as being used by Jews against Christians, and as being applied by Christians themselves to the descent of the Spirit at Christ's Baptism. Lastly we find a Jewish Messiah—accepted at least as Messiah by the great Rabbi Akibah, and, for a time, by a great multitude of his countrymen—who perished fifteen years before Justin wrote, judged in an ancient tradition by reference to Isaiah's prediction; and internal evidence indicates that long before

---

[1] [**674** *a*] Comp. Jer. iv. 12 *πνεῦμα πληρώσεως*: but it means "wind", not "spirit", of "fulness". It happens that מלא "full" might be confused by transposition with מאל "from God": but there is no instance of it in O.T.

[2] It may be asked, "If the Synoptists have Isaiah as their basis, why do they omit all mention of 'resting'?" That point will be dealt with in the next chapter.

[3] [**675** *a*] The Eng. Conc. gives it in Is. xi. 2 *π. τοῦ θεοῦ*, xl. 7 (LXX om.), xl. 13 *νοῦν κυρίου*, lix. 19 *ἡ ὀργὴ παρὰ κυρίου*, lxi. 1 "spirit of the *Lord Jehovah*," *π. κυρίου*, lxiii. 14 *π. παρὰ κυρίου*. In Ezekiel it occurs twice, xi. 5 LXX simply "spirit" (no "the" nor "of the Lord"), xxxvii. 1 "He carried me out in the spirit of the Lord," LXX "the Lord carried me out *in* [*the*] *spirit*."

that time the nature and number of the Messianic "spirits" were a subject of controversy between Jews and Christians.

[676] Additional evidence that the Christian narrative is based upon Isaiah's prophecy might be derived from the fact that the prophecy, and a large number of Christian traditions, agree in describing the Spirit as "abiding" or "resting" on the Messiah. To dwell on this would be to anticipate the subject of the next section. But our conclusion, so far, is that "what descended" was described in the Original as "(the) Spirit of (the) Lord."

§ 2. *How? And with what result? The different traditions*

[677] The Synoptists have:

Mk i. 10 (lit.).	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 22.	Jn i. 32.
"...the Spirit descending into him as a dove."	"...the Spirit of God descending, coming on[1] him like a dove," or, "descending like a dove, coming on him."	"...the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form as a dove on[1] him."	"I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove from heaven, and it abode on him."

John omits "as a dove" in his account of the word of the Lord previously uttered to the Baptist:—

Jn i. 33: "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending ∧ and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit."

[1] [677 *a*] After verbs of motion and before personal nouns or pronouns, "on (ἐπί)" sometimes means "to", *e.g.* Mt. x. 18 "ye shall be brought *to* rulers," Lk. xxiii. 1 "led *to* Pilate", i. 16 "turn *to* the Lord," but more freq. "on".

Diatessaron (*in its present text*) has, "The Holy Spirit descended upon him in the similitude of the body of a dove ..... And John bare witness and said, I beheld the Spirit descend from heaven like a dove; and it abode upon him." It substitutes "lighting" for "abiding" in Jn i. 33, where "as a dove" is omitted by John.

[678] In the following non-canonical traditions it will be found that, without exception, those which mention "resting" omit "dove", and *vice versa*.

(1) *Ephrem's Comment on Diatessaron* (pp. 42–3): "And the Holy Spirit, which *rested* upon Him when He was baptized ..... Whereas on that day many were baptized, the Spirit descended ∧ upon One, and *rested*, that He, who was not distinguished visibly from the rest, might by this sign be marked off from all (ab omnibus discerneretur, ? discerned by all)": "And when from the light that arose on the waters, and from the voice that came down from heaven, ∧ he [Satan] knew ....." Mention is made of "resting", but not of the "dove".

(2) *The Nazarene Gospel:* "The whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended ∧ and *rested* upon Him ∧, and said to Him, ..." Mention of "resting", but not of the "dove".

(3) *The Testament of the Patriarchs:* "Consecration, with a Voice of the Father, shall come upon Him ∧ ..... and a Spirit of Understanding and consecration shall *rest* upon Him ∧ in the water." Mention of "resting", but not of the "dove".

(4) *The Ebionite Gospel:* "He saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of *a dove* that came down and entered into Him ∧." Mention of the "dove", but not of "abiding" or "resting".

(5) *Justin Martyr:* "... that as *a dove* the Holy Spirit lighted on Him ∧ ..... the Spirit that came upon Him in the form of *a dove* ∧ ..... the Holy Spirit therefore .....

lighted on Him ^.” Mention of the “dove”, but not of “abiding” or “resting”.

(6) *Celsus in Origen:* “the story of the *dove* that lighted on the Saviour ^ ..... you say the phantom of a *bird* lighted on you from the lower-air ^.” Mention of “the dove”, or “a bird”, but not of “abiding” or “resting”.

(7) *The Sibyl:* “He shall be the first to see God [revealed in] gentle [aspect] in (or, through) the Spirit coming (lit. becoming) with the white pinions of *a dove*”: “The Spirit *lighted* (lit. flew) upon Him who ... having clothed Himself with flesh quickly *flew* to the Father’s abode.” There is a subsequent mention of “letting go *a bird*.” Mention of a “dove” or “bird”, but not of “resting”.

§ 3. *“Into” Jesus, or “on” Him?*

[679] (i) The first fact to note is that—with the exception of one of the two Johannine passages and the Arabic text of *Diatessaron*—those traditions which mention the “dove” omit the “abiding” or “resting”, and those which mention the “resting” omit the “dove”[1].

(ii) According to John, “descent *as a dove*” was witnessed by the Baptist, but “*descent*” *alone* was the sign appointed by God.

(iii) The three non-canonical traditions that mention “resting” are Eastern, *viz.* Ephrem Syrus, the Nazarene Gospel, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.

[680] (iv) The Ebionite Gospel follows Mark, but defines the meaning more clearly, by describing the Spirit as “coming

[1] [679 *a*] In Mk i. 10, ℵ b Corb. and al. (see Swete) ins. “abiding”. Also in Mt. iii. 16, SS. (instead of “*coming* on him”) has “*abode* on him” and so has (F. C. Conybeare, *Key of Truth*, p. lxxxix) “the old Georgian txt.” These therefore constitute additional exceptions.

down and entering *into*" Jesus, not as "lighting *on* Him", or "coming *on* Him".[1]

[**681**] (v) In Matthew, a superficial view suggests that "and" must be inserted so as to give "descending *and* coming on him like a dove." R.V. has actually inserted this, on the authority of a reading supported by slight evidence[2] (and not mentioned by W.H. even as a marginal alternative). The Revisers perhaps thought that, without this interpolation, "coming" was superfluous in the sentence "descending like a dove *coming* upon him." But it is possible to connect "like a dove" with the *following* participle ("coming") instead of with the *preceding* one ("descending"); and then "coming" may not be superfluous; for "like" may be intended to call attention *not to the form assumed by the Spirit but to its way of coming*, or to the motive of its coming: "He saw the Spirit descending—*coming upon him as* [*with the flight of*] *a dove* [*alighting on her nest*]."

[1] [**680** *a*] (*a*) Neither Thayer nor Swete (on Mk i. 10) gives any instance (in the correct text of N.T.) of εἴς τινα after ἔρχομαι &c. meaning "come *to* (or, *on*) a person." But εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτόν means "entered *into* him" (of "spirits" &c.) in Lk. viii. 30, 32 (comp. Mk v. 12, 13), xxii. 3; Jn xiii. 27. Evangelists, scribes, or editors, not understanding that the Spirit passed *into* Jesus, and confused by the notion of the dove alighting *on* Him, have substituted the latter. Thus Matthew and Luke have substituted ἐπί (as also ℵAL &c. in Mk). In Mk, after "descending", ℵ has "*and abiding on* him," b "*and abiding in* him," Corb. "*on* him *and abiding*." Lk. xv. 17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθών affords no proof that εἴς τινα, even in a metaphor, could mean anything but "into": for it may be illustrated by the phrase "Become *within* [thyself] (ἔνδον)", and rendered "coming *into* thyself", *i.e.* into the bounds of thy nature (as Pope, ironically, "Then drop *into* thyself, and be a fool").

(*b*) The variations of Mt., Lk., and the MSS. of Mk, may be illustrated by Ezek. ii. 2, iii. 24, xxxvii. 10, "the spirit entered (lit. came) *into* (lit. in, -ב) me, or, them," LXX (ii. 2, iii. 24) "*came on* me", ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμέ, but (xxxvii. 10) "entered *into* them", εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτούς.

[2] [**681** *a*] The MSS. that insert "and" also change the ambiguous ἐπί —which may mean "toward" as well as "on"—into πρός which must mean "toward". This shews that they are amending the whole context for clearness and diminishes their trustworthiness.

[682] From these facts we infer that there was an early difference of opinion. Did the Spirit descend "*into*" Jesus? In that case, after having been visible for a brief space, it would vanish. Or did it descend "*upon*" Jesus? In that case, questions might arise, such as those which Cerinthus tried (**689—90**) to answer, as to what became of the dove.

[683] Also, comparing Luke with the other Evangelists, we infer that Mark and Matthew either believed, or at least left their readers free to believe, that "as a dove" described, not the *form* assumed by the Spirit, but the *nature* of its descent; that Luke, interpreting the words as implying *form*, inserted—or availed himself of some tradition that inserted—"in bodily *form*" to make that meaning clear; and that John, differing from Luke, returned to Mark's tradition.

[684] The facts of this and of the preceding section point to the need of investigating the following questions: What are the Jewish traditions, and more especially those in prophecy, about the Dove, and about the "resting", or "abiding", of the Spirit? Are there any Biblical instances in which these words are confused with others, or with one another? What are the Greek traditions about the Dove, and is there any reason to think that a casual corruption of Hebrew, introducing an erroneous mention of a dove in early translations, would find such favour in Greek and Roman congregations as to take permanent root in the whole Church?

CHAPTER VII

THE DOVE

§ 1. *The Dove in Jewish literature*

[685] APART from (1) the story of the dove in the Deluge, (2) the prescriptions of the sacrifices of turtle-doves and young pigeons, and (3) a few expressions of endearment in the Song of Solomon ("thou hast dove's eyes", "my love, my dove" &c.) and two mentions of the word in the Psalms (lv. 6 "Oh that I had wings like a dove, then would I flee away and be at rest," lxviii. 13 "As the wings of a dove covered with silver"), we may say that the use of the word is confined to prophecy[1]. The prophets use it as the emblem of sorrow or penitence, of timorousness resulting in flight—once, even of "silliness" in fleeing to vain helpers[2]. In later Jewish literature the notion of silliness or timorousness was subordinated, and the Dove became the recognized emblem

[1] On 2 K. vi. 25 "dove's dung", the only exception, see *Ency.* col. 1130.

[2] [685 *a*] Hos. vii. 11 "Ephraim is like a *silly dove* without understanding, they call unto Egypt, they go to Assyria." The other prophetic instances are Is. xxxviii. 14 "I did mourn *as a dove*," lix. 11 "we...mourn sore *like doves*," lx. 8 "Who are these that fly as a cloud and *as the doves* to their windows? Surely the isles shall wait for me"—where the context indicates Gentiles drawing near to God, comp. Jer. xlviii. 28; Ezek. vii. 16; Hos. xi. 11; Nah. ii. 7. These are all the instances in the prophets. It occurs as the title of Ps. lvi. 1 "To the *dove of* distant terebinths" (Gesen. 401 *b*).

of captive or exiled Israel sorrowfully longing for the restoration of Zion and fleeing to Jehovah for succour[1]. Philo indeed once says that the "turtle-dove" is the emblem of Divine Wisdom. But he expressly distinguishes that bird (as the Levitical Law also does) from the "dove (or, pigeon)"[2] mentioned by our Evangelists, calling the latter the emblem of human wisdom, "a gregarious creature living in the cities of men." Even supposing the "turtle-dove" to have been contemplated in the Original of the Gospels, that bird would not convey the notion of a strength-infusing and re-creating Spirit but rather that of mourning over desolation, as in the story of the Jewish Rabbi who, amid the ruins of Jerusalem, "heard a voice *cooing like a dove*, saying 'Woe unto the children, on account of whose iniquities I have desolated my House, burned my Temple, and banished them among the nations'."[3]

[686] On the other side it may be urged that Wetstein (on Mt. iii. 16) amid several instances from Western literature quotes one from the Talmud as follows, "The Dove was believed by the ancient Jews to represent the Holy Spirit. (Cantic. ii. 12) 'The voice of the turtle' is to the Chaldæan interpreter 'the voice of the Holy Spirit' (Chag. c. 2) '*The Spirit of God was borne upon the waters like a dove* (כיונה) *that is brooding on her young*'." He adds, "The Dove is also regarded as the symbol of gentleness and sincerity..... And

[1] Levy (ii. 229 *b*) quotes the appearance of a dove as an omen of the temporary exile of David. See also Hamburger ("Taube").

[2] [685 *b*] Philo i. 490–1, "turtle-dove" = *τρυγών*: "dove" or "pigeon" = *περιστερά*. *Περιστερά* is rendered "pigeon" in Lk. ii. 24, "young *pigeons*", lit. "young-ones of pigeons" = LXX (Lev. v. 7, 11 &c.) *νοσσοὺς περιστερῶν* (בני יונה): "pigeon" = יונה: "turtle-dove" = תור. Except in this Levitical phrase, R.V. translates יונה by "dove".

[3] [685 *c*] Berachoth 3ª. In Rom. viii. 26 "the Spirit" is said to "make intercession with groanings that cannot be uttered," meaning the Spirit of God inspiring, and identifying with itself, the spirit of man, and regarded as resident in a penitent and aspiring heart that desires to express itself in prayer.

whereas God warned the Magi by the appearance of a star, and Joseph by a dream, it remained that He should also use the semblance of a bird to inform John the Baptist."

[687] This statement, made by so learned a commentator, deserves consideration; but he appears in this case to have been led by the numerous instances of Western symbolism to attribute the same symbolism erroneously to one instance (that is all he quotes) which he assumes to represent the usage of "the ancient Jews". Moreover the full context of the quotation indicates that it was made by a certain Ben Zoma (who is elsewhere called "son of obscenity" and "demented"[1]) and that it was at once contradicted: "Rabbi Yehoshua asked him: 'Whence and whither, Ben Zoma?' He replied: 'I have been considering the distance between the upper and lower waters, and it is no more than the measure of three fingers; for it is said (Gen. i. 2) *The Spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters*—like a dove hovering over her young without touching them.' Rabbi Yehoshua then observed to his disciples: 'Ben Zoma is still out of his mind; for was it not on the *first* day that the Spirit of God is said to have hovered over the face of the waters, whereas the separation of the upper from the lower waters did not take place till the *second* day?'"[2]

[1] [687 *a*] Hershon, Genes. with Talm. C., p. 35. It is, however, only fair to add that (so far as Schwab's Index goes) none of the passages (ten in number) in the Jerusalem Talmud in which Ben Zoma is mentioned speak of him as a heretic or immoral. Some of them record his opinions with obvious respect; others mention him (but not contumeliously) as differing from "the other Sages". Probably that Index is far from complete. It omits Chag. ii. 1 (Schwab vi. 270) describing him as one who "died after beholding Paradise and of him it is said (Ps. cxvii. 15) 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints'." Sayings of Ben Zoma (Aboth iv. 1—4) find a place in the present Jewish Prayer Book.

[2] *Ib.* p. 14. Rodkinson *ad loc.* says "We have omitted... what happened to Ben Zoma with R. Jehoshua b. Hananiah, as it seems to us the version of the Palestinian Talmud is correct." If this system of

[688] It is extremely improbable that Ben Zoma intended to suggest, by the words "like a dove", that the Holy Spirit appeared visibly as a bird. He probably meant nothing more than this, that the *motion and action* of the Spirit ("hovering and not touching") might be illustrated by the *motion* of a bird over her young[1]. Possibly, he may have been influenced by recollections of Christian accounts of the Messiah's Baptism ; but whatever may have been his meaning, it is clear that the Jewish tradition, far from taking it as typical of the "belief of the ancient Jews," holds it up to ridicule as the heterodox and impossible conjecture of a demented heretic. It is apparently in the same spirit of hostility to such symbolism that another tradition (Levy ii. 229*a*) relates how the image of a dove was found on the top of Mount Gerizim to which the Samaritans offered prayers. The only instance that has occurred to me of a spirit assuming the form of a bird is one in the Babylonian Talmud where Satan metamorphoses himself into a sparrow in order to tempt David[2].

§ 2. *The Dove in Gentile Literature*

[689] On the other hand in the Iliad, the Aeneid, and Greek and Roman literature generally, the eagle and the dove are frequently used as divine messengers or emblems, and Wetstein appropriately quotes a saying of Eustathius on Homer, "It is usual with the poet to liken the gods in his poetry to birds...and this is grander than likening them to

editing the Babylonian Talmud were consistently adhered to, it would be seriously abridged.

[1] [688 *a*] I find this view confirmed by Dr Edersheim (*Life of Jesus*, i. 287) who also adds that a parallel passage (Ber. R. 2) has "*that bird*" instead of "*dove*", and that Ben Zoma "is described in Rabbinic literature as tainted with Christian views." Hershon (Genes. Talm. p. 35) quotes Chag. 14 col. 2 "Ben Zoma (son of obscenity)." But see **687** *a*.

[2] Sanhedr. 107[a].

pedestrian animals: for there is a kinship between the things of heaven and the creatures that fly aloft[1]." Egyptian art frequently represented a human soul by a bird. In Rome, an eagle was let fly from the funeral pyre of Augustus and of later emperors, as an emblem of the imperial soul ascending to heaven[2]; and Lucian, in ridicule, represents a vulture as rising from the flames of the rapacious Peregrinus[3]. Although the Gentile Christians must also have been influenced by the saying of Jesus, "wise as serpents, simple as doves," and by the story of the Baptism of Christ, there is reason to think that the Christian pictures of doves in the Catacombs with the legends "Innocent soul", "Simple (simplex) soul", were suggested originally by Western not by Jewish thought. In particular, the heresy of the Egyptian Cerinthus, who taught that the Christ descended as a dove on Jesus at the Baptism, and flew back[4] again from Him on the Cross, is probably of Gentile origin.

[690] The *Martyrdom of Polycarp* says that when the sword was plunged into his side (§ 16) "there came forth [*a dove and*] a flow of blood so as to quench the fire." The bracketed words are omitted by Eusebius, by all the extant Greek MSS., and by the Latin and Syriac versions, but "were certainly found in the archetypal MS.[5]." Lightfoot says that "the dove seems out of place. The blood does its work by extinguishing the fire; but nothing more is heard of the

[1] [**689** *a*] Wetst. (on Mt. iii. 16) quoting Eustath. on Il. vii. 59. A Jew would have probably assented to this proposition—provided that it was limited to *false* gods, as in the above-mentioned instance of (Sanhedr. 107 *a*) Satan appearing to David in the likeness of a bird.

[2] [**689** *b*] Comp. Just. Mart. 1 *Apol.* § 21 "What of the emperors who die among yourselves, whom you regularly deem worthy of deification, and in whose behalf you produce some one who swears he has seen the cremated Cæsar going up to heaven?" This *affidavit* appears to have been an adjunct to the eagle. See Lightf. on *Mart. Polycarp.* § 16.

[3] *De Mort. Peregr.* § 39.

[4] [**689** *c*] Iren. i. 26. 1 "revolasse".

[5] Lightf. shews the improbability of the conjecture στύραξ.

dove." Perhaps, however, a heretic might have urged the same objection against some versions of the Synoptic account of the dove, unless they could be interpreted as meaning that the bird passed "into" Jesus, or "abode" invisibly on Him. And it may have been as an answer to this very objection, "nothing more is heard of the dove," that Cerinthus offered his heretical suggestion that afterwards it "flew back"[1].

[691] The only passage in the Bible where the Gentile Churches could find in the Dove the symbol of God's peace-bringing Spirit is the description of the Deluge, where the bird returns (Gen. viii. 11) "with an olive leaf in her mouth," and a very late tradition of Sohar, perhaps blending this story with that of the brooding on the waters, says[2] "No man knows whither that bird has gone. But she has returned to her place.....And she shall bring a crown in her mouth and place it on the head of King Messiah coming on Him and not coming on Him," *i.e.* hovering above Him. But a more trustworthy authority makes the dove in this story a symbol —from the Jewish point of view—of "Israel's vocation, to

[1] [690 *a*] In the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, the objection to omitting the "dove" is, that, without it, there is *no mention of the Martyr's death.* I venture to suggest that—the style being highly emotional at this point —it might be lawful to render literally καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος ἐξῆλθεν περιστερά: "And when the executioner had done this, *he went forth* (*as*) *a dove*," but to give it a poetic meaning, "the pure soul of the Martyr went forth from its prison to the free air of Paradise." Lightf. thinks that the "dove" was interpolated by Pionius. That biographer certainly interpolated an apparition of a "dove" at the consecration of Polycarp: but is not that compatible with the view that Pionius first *found* a story of a dove going *from* the Martyr and then *added* a story of a dove coming *to* him? Similarly Cerinthus fabricated a story of a dove flying *away from* Jesus, but he is not generally accused of inventing the story that a dove came *to* Jesus. And may not Eusebius and others have omitted the "dove", because they too, like Lightfoot, felt that it *did nothing*, not perceiving that "went forth" implied departure from the cage of the body to the freedom of heaven?

[2] Schöttg. ii. 537 comment. on Gen. viii. 12 "and she returned not again unto him any more."

bring to mankind faith, peace, and propitiation[1]." From a Greek and Roman point of view, however, the Dove is associated not with fear, sorrow, or penitent trustfulness, but with Love and Peace. Reading their notions into the narrative of the Deluge, the Gentiles might find in the Dove returning to the Ark with the olive-leaf, a type of the Spirit of Peace, coming towards, and entering into, Christ, the Ark of our Salvation, on the waters of the Jordan. As the result of all these Western prepossessions, it would follow that the story of the Spirit descending on the Prince of Peace "like a dove", even if it sprang from a misunderstanding, could not easily be dislodged from Christian Gospels, when once it had obtained a footing in the non-Jewish Churches.

§ 3. *Obstacles to the acceptance of the tradition of the Dove*

[692] Beside the above-mentioned obstacles to the acceptance of the Dove as an accurate representation of the vision seen by John the Baptist, there is another based on the personality of the seer himself. He is generally and justly regarded as a prophet of an austere character, resembling Elijah with whom he is so frequently associated. It is barely possible to conceive that some Jewish seer of later days, with Jeremiah's plaintive tone but without his force, might—like the Jewish Rabbi above-mentioned—have heard the Voice of Jehovah "as the cooing of a dove"; but, if we believe that the visions of the prophets were adapted to the spirits of the prophets, then Elijah and the Baptist would seem the most unlikely of the whole prophetic order to receive a revelation of God's own nature through this particular emblem. The only way to meet this objection would be to call the revelation a psychological miracle; that is to say, the last of the prophets must be supposed to see a vision alien at once to

[1] Hamburger, i. 978.

his own character and to the whole course of prophetic revelation, a vision in which the God of Israel is revealed under an emblem used by the prophets to denote timorous penitence, and in post-prophetic literature denoting the Daughter of Sion sorrowfully fleeing back to her Lord[1].

[693] Again, if we are to suppose that God vouchsafed to the Baptist an absolutely unprecedented revelation of Himself under the form of a Dove, in order to open his eyes to the beginning of a wholly new Dispensation, should we not expect that, in preparing the prophet to receive this sign of the Messiah, the word of God would make some mention of its novel and special nature, "Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending *as a dove*"? Yet John, while following the Synoptists in using the phrase elsewhere—except that he assigns it to the prophet while the Synoptists use it in their own person—*omits it in the message of God.* This suggests that, although John was unwilling to wholly omit the picturesque tradition that had established itself in the three Gospels, and had amplified itself in the third, he felt that "as a dove" was not of the essence of the vision. Perhaps he thought it meant simply "with bird-like flight";

[1] [692 *a*] It is quite possible that some of the Western Evangelists, in accepting the Dove as the emblem seen by the Baptist, perceived in it a contrast to his previous preaching: "He had predicted 'fire' and 'blast' and the 'axe' at the root of the tree, just as Elijah had seen visions of 'tempest', 'earthquake' and 'fire': then suddenly to Elijah there came a revelation of the gentler attributes of God, and so it was with his successor." Thus they might argue. But the absence of divine and strengthening power from all Jewish associations with the Dove ought to guard us from assimilating the bird-like emblem to "the still small Voice." There is no real parallelism—from the Jewish point of view—between the bird that moans and sorrows and flees away, and the "Voice" that quietly but sternly rebukes Elijah's past and dictates his future.

It must also be remembered that, as far as we can judge from the Gospels, the Baptist is regarded by Jesus as the last and greatest of the *old* prophets, but not as being in the New Kingdom, and therefore not under what the Western Evangelists might call "the dispensation of the Dove."

perhaps he thought it a possible inaccuracy arising from a misunderstanding, but was not sufficiently sure of this to adopt a negative view.

[694] Reviewing the evidence, we find (1) that the "dove" is omitted by some early traditions, of Eastern origin, which lay stress upon the "resting" of the Spirit; (2) that the "resting"—or, as John calls it, "abiding"—is omitted by the Synoptists, and some others, who insert the "dove"; (3) that in Biblical Hebrew the Dove is for the most part an emblem of fear; (4) that in post-biblical Hebrew the Dove is the emblem of persecuted, penitent Israel, trusting in the Lord; (5) that in later Jewish tradition a comparison of the brooding of the Spirit to the brooding of a dove is mentioned only once, and then with disapproval, being attributed to a Jewish Rabbi who lived at the beginning of the second century and who, according to some authorities, was regarded as tainted with Christian tendencies; (6) that the Greeks and Romans freely adopted the Dove as a Divine emblem, and also as an emblem of a spotless soul; (7) that Cerinthus took the Dove to represent Christ descending upon Jesus, and asserted that the bird subsequently "flew back"; (8) that Polycarp's Martyrdom contains an account, possibly interpolated, of a dove going forth from the Martyr in the moment of his death, while a later biography contains another account, certainly false, of a dove alighting on Polycarp at his consecration.

All this points to some early error, favoured and perpetuated by Gentile prepossessions, as to the tradition about the Dove. It remains to consider errors in the LXX connected with the word "dove", and the possibility of the recurrence of similar errors in the Gospels.

§ 4. *"Dove" might be confused with "resting"*

[695] We have found a long series of Christian writers connecting our Lord's Baptism with Isaiah's "resting" of the

Spirit upon the Messiah, even though they do not quote John's phrase about "the abiding" of the Spirit on Jesus. Combining this with the fact that some accounts inserting the "resting" (or "abiding") omit "dove", while many that insert "dove" omit "resting" (or "abiding"), we are led to take as a working hypothesis the assumption that the Original mentioned "resting" and not "dove", and to ask whether the two have ever been, or could be, confused in translation from Hebrew.

[**696**] That the two words could be confused is manifest from the similarity of the Hebrew of "dove" to the Hebrew of several forms of the verb "rest", *e.g.* "he will rest", the former being יונה, and the latter ינוח, so that the mere transposition of a *vaw* would make them almost indistinguishable. That they have not actually been confused in the LXX is hardly surprising, considering that "dove" is not a very common word, and that the context, where "dove" really occurs in the Hebrew text, often makes the meaning clear. But we can point to passages where either the LXX, or Aquila (usually a most accurate translator), has introduced "dove" without any warrant in the Hebrew, or has substituted for "dove" some word of similar letters but not so similar to it as the above-mentioned form of "resting". The word "dove" is also twice miswritten in the Jerusalem Targum in a manner calculated to originate an erroneous tradition—in context that favoured the error—which, it is just possible, may explain the story (**1014–5**) about the coming of the Greeks to Jesus immediately before the Voice from Heaven recorded by John[1].

[1] [**696** *a*] "Rest"=נוח; "He will rest"=ינוח. The form ינח is so frequently used that Tromm. recognizes it as a separate verb from נוח, but Gesen. regards the former as part of the latter.

(1) "Dove"=יונה, (2) "oppress"=ינה, (3) "Javan" *i.e.* "Greece"=יון. Owing to the frequent omission of *yod* and *vaw*, and to the interchange of one with the other, these three words are actually confused, and

§ 5. *The "Dove" and Joseph's "rod", the legends*

[**697**] It is a weak point in the preceding section that, although we have shewn that the Hebrew "dove" is confused by the LXX and Aquila with words *similar* to "resting", we have not been able to allege any instance where it has been confused with "resting" *itself*. We shall now endeavour to shew that this last confusion has probably taken place in very early Christian documents connecting the "dove" with the "rod" of Joseph the husband of Mary, and based upon a literal interpretation of Isaiah (xi. 1), whose words they read as follows: "And there shall come forth a *rod* out of the stock of Jesse[1] (*i.e.* from the family of Jesse ... and a *dove upon him* (or, *it*)."

[**698**] (1) The Protevangelium Jacobi, one of the earliest of the apocryphal Gospels, after describing Mary as being reared "in the temple of the Lord as a dove," and "receiving food from the hand of an angel," says that an angel appointed that the widowers of the people should bring their rods (§ 8) "and, to whomsoever the Lord shall shew a sign, his wife she shall be." Accordingly (§ 9) "Joseph, throwing away his axe," brought his rod. The rods being returned to their owners in order, Joseph received the last one, "and behold *a dove came out of the rod and flew*[2] *upon Joseph's head*."

---

any one of them might be confused with forms of "rest". "Oppressing" = LXX "dove" in Zeph. iii. 1, and "Grecian" in Jerem. xlvi. 16, l. 16. In Jerem. xlvi. 16, Aq. has "dove", l. 16, Aq. (Field) "drunken" (? fr. רוה).

Levy *Ch.* (i. 330 *b*) gives two instances where MSS. of the Jerusalem Targum (on Lev. xiv. 22, 30) substitute יוון for יונן. As regards the coming of the Greeks, see **1014—5**.

[1] [**697** *a*] "Rod", so A.V. and LXX (R.V. "shoot"), see below **704** *c*. "Stock", so R.V., A.V. "stem". In modern English the meaning would be more exactly expressed by "stump", see below **704** *d*. The preceding words of Isaiah speak of "lopping", "hewing down", &c.

[2] [**698** *a*] "Flew (ἐπετάσθη)", so in Clark's Transl. and prob. correctly,

[699] (2) The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew is probably later than the Protevangelium. It mentions no angel predicting a sign, but describes the high priest as proposing to the Congregation that God should be consulted, by means of the lot, as to the man to whom the Virgin should be entrusted. The lot falls on the tribe of Judah, and every man of that tribe without a wife is ordered to bring his rod. The high priest then enquires of the Lord. The answer of the Lord is (§ 8) "The man *from the extremity*[1] *of whose rod* (ex cuius cacumine virgae) *a dove shall come forth and fly towards heaven*, and in whose hand the rod when given back shall exhibit this sign, to him let Mary be delivered to be kept." Joseph's rod is at first overlooked by the priest, so that no sign comes. But when his rod is brought out to him, unwilling to receive it and humbly standing last, and when he lays his hand on it, "immediately, *from the extremity of it, came forth a dove whiter than snow, beautiful exceedingly, which, after long flying about the roof* (fastigia) *of the temple, at length flew up to the heavens.*"

---

as the LXX uses the word thus. But L.S. does not recognize this meaning. In literary Gk it could mean nothing but "was spread out". See below, **707** *a*.

[1] [**699** *a*] "Extremity"="cacumen", rendered by Clark "point" and "top" in this extract, but "end" and "top" in the Nativity of Mary. In a "staff", the "point" would naturally be the bottom, but, when raised aloft, might be called the "top". This detail—trifling in itself—may be of some importance if the author of the legend based it upon Isaiah's prediction about "resting" (taken as "dove") which is preceded by "from its roots", *i.e.* from the roots of the "rod". Taking the "rod" to be not a bough but a *staff*, he would naturally say that "its roots" meant the "bottom" or "point". But when the priest handed back the rod to Joseph so that the point was in the air, and the dove alighted on it in that position, it would naturally be called the "top".

It will be seen hereafter that the latest legend, approximating to the Canonical Gospels, makes the dove descend "from heaven" and merely settle "on the extremity" of the rod.

[700] In describing the answer of the Lord, one MS. inserts "The man in whose rod this sign shall appear, namely, *that* [*rod*] *which puts forth leaf and produces nuts*," before the mention of the "dove".

[701] (3) The third and probably latest testimony is from the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary. The Answer of the Lord is described as follows: "In the hearing of all a voice issued from the oracle and from the mercy-seat that *according to the prophecy of Isaiah* a man should be sought out to whom the Virgin ought to be entrusted and espoused. For it is clear that Isaiah says '*A rod shall come forth from the root of Jesse and a flower shall ascend from his root, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him* ..... and he shall be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord[1].' According to this prophecy therefore he predicted[2] that all men of the house and family of David, marriageable and not bound to a wife, should bring their rods to the altar; and the man whose rod, after being brought, *budded and flowered, and on the extremity of whose rod the Spirit of the Lord settled* (consedisset) in the form of a dove, he was the man to whom the Virgin ought to be entrusted and espoused."

[702] The two earlier writers introduced Joseph without mention of his descent. This writer says (§ 8): "Now there was among the rest Joseph of the house and family of David of great age, and when all brought their rods in order (juxta ordinem, ?according to the order) Joseph alone kept his back." Hence no sign was given by God; and the perplexed high

[1] The writer quotes Is. xi. 1, 2 and part of xi. 3, according to the LXX, as above (666).

[2] "Praedixit", if correct and used in its ordinary sense, would seem to mean "According to these words *Isaiah predicted* what was about to happen in the matter of Joseph's rod." But the parallel passages of 698—9 suggest that "praedixit" means "(the high priest) forewarned" them that they should bring their rods.

priest consulted Him again and ascertained that "he alone to whom the Virgin ought to be espoused had not brought his rod. Joseph therefore was detected. For when he had brought his rod and *a dove coming from heaven settled on the extremity thereof*, it was manifest to all that the Virgin was to be espoused to him."

§ 6. *The "Dove" and Joseph's "rod", the legends explained*

[**703**] The reader will note that no quotation of prophecy occurs till the latest of the three narratives. This silence may be paralleled from Mark the earliest of the Gospels, which in the course of its narrative *never quotes prophecy as being fulfilled*, not even in the entry to Jerusalem where Matthew and John quote Zechariah, nor in "the parting of the garments" where John quotes from the Psalms. Yet it is highly probable that Mark wrote these two descriptions (and many others) with prophecies in his mind. So here, we may approach the analysis of the three extracts with the feeling that probably all the writers had in view traditions based upon Isaiah's prophecy about the "resting" of the Spirit, though the third alone quotes it. If so, since the prophecy makes no mention of a "dove", and since it has been shewn that "dove" and "resting" could be easily confused, and probably have been confused in accounts of the Baptism, the conclusion becomes very probable indeed that these legends spring from the same confusion.

[**704**] We shall now shew how the legend, in its different shapes, may have sprung from a literalizing of the prophecy of Isaiah. It must be premised that the immediately preceding words describe Jehovah as "lopping the bough with terror" and "cutting down the thickets of the forest with iron[1]."

[1] [**704** *a*] A very remarkable passage in the Jerusalem Talmud (Berach. ii. 4 (3)) quotes Is. xi. 1, along with the words immediately preceding it, as

Then follows the prophecy about the Nazer or Branch (Is. xi. 1): "And there shall go forth a rod[1] from the (lit.) stump[2] of Jesse and a branch from his (or, its) roots shall

though the "lopping of the bough with terror," and its context, meant *the destruction of the Temple*, which was as it were to be cut down shortly before the coming of the Messiah, who would cause it to spring up again. It is just possible that the description of Joseph as "throwing away his axe" (peculiar to the Protevangelium) just before the mention of the "rod", may be derived from some version of the "lopping of the bough with terror," with or without confusion of Hebrew. (Is. x. 33 "terror"= מערצה: "axe"=(Bib. Heb.) מעצר: but moreover Is. xi. 1 "from the stem"=מגזע: "axe"=(N. Heb.) מגזרא.) It will be remembered that the Baptist speaks of "the axe laid at the root of the tree" just before Christ's baptism.

[**704** *b*] The passage in the Jerusalem Talmud contains a strange admixture of (*a*) Jewish with (*b*) semi-Christian tradition. (*a*) The Messiah's name is Menahem, *i.e.* consolation, his father is Hezekiah, his mother (see Eng. transl. p. 45 n.) desires to strangle him at birth in order to save the Temple: (*b*) he is snatched away by winds and tempests out of the mother's hands (Rev. xii. 5), the Messiah when born will bring back ploughs and yokes into use (Justin Mart. *Tryph.* § 88 "a carpenter making ploughs and yokes").

[1] [**704** *c*] "Rod (חטר)", so A.V. and LXX ῥάβδος, and the Christian legends must have adopted this rendering. R.V. has "shoot". But (Gesen.) the radical meaning suggests "staff", "lance", "sceptre". It means "staff" in Targum Hebrew, and nowhere "branch" or "twig". Hence some translators might insist that it must be taken literally. In O.T. the word occurs elsewhere only in Prov. xiv. 3 where the LXX has "staff", βακτηρία, and this makes an excellent metaphor to describe a fool striking right and left with his words as with a stick, or staff.

[2] [**704** *d*] "Stump (גזע)" (A.V. "stem", R.V. "stock") has for its radical meaning (Gesen.) "cut off" or "saw", and it is rendered by LXX (2) ῥίζα "root", (1) στέλεχος "trunk". It occurs in Job xiv. 7–8 "For there is hope of a tree, if it be *cut down*, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease, though the root thereof wax old in the earth and the *stump* (R.V. stock) thereof die in the ground." Comp. Is. xl. 24 "They [*i.e.* the great ones of the earth] have not been planted; yea, they have not been sown; yea, their *stump* hath not taken root in the earth," where the meaning appears to be that under the withering blast of God's wrath the tree has become as if it had never been planted and its decaying *stump* has no more fresh roots. R.V. "stock" scarcely conveys to modern readers the notion of "cutting" or "lopping" (except in connection with grafting).

bear-fruit[1] and there-shall-rest upon him (or, upon it) the Spirit of Jehovah, the spirit" &c.

[705] We must now imagine Christian Evangelists in Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, or Rome, asking "What is this '*Rod from the Stump of Jesse*' which all connect with the birth of the Messiah and some with the coming of a dove to Him, or into Him, or the resting of a dove upon Him?" The answers might be two, as follows:

"'The Rod from the Stump of Jesse' means a sceptre-like branch, or royal descendant, from the decayed house of David. Instead of 'there shall rest upon him the Spirit,' we should read (1) 'as a dove, upon Him the Spirit,' or perhaps (2) 'there shall rest as a dove upon Him the Spirit.'" These are the answers of the Canonical Evangelists. The former (1) is the view of the Synoptists, the latter (2) of John.

[706] But here Jewish traditions might intervene to say that "the dove" could not mean the Spirit of the Lord: "The Dove is the daughter of Sion regarded as the Bride of Jehovah; or it means, in dreams, the bride of a mortal[2]; here, then, it may be the bride of the Lord's father namely Joseph; 'The stump of Jesse' means 'Joseph the humble descendant of the house of Jesse[3],' on whom the Dove, or

[1] [704 *e*] "Bear-fruit (פרה)", A.V. "grow", LXX "*go up*", *ἀναβήσεται*, perhaps taking the word for פרח "grow up". "Grow up" is expressed by *ἀναβαίνω* "go up" in Mk iv. 7, 8, 32. It has been noted above (700) that one MS. of Pseudo-Matthew interpolates "*puts forth leaf and produces nuts.*" That is an attempt to conflate with the tradition of the Dove "*going up*" another tradition approximating to, but not quite expressing, the Hebrew. Strictly speaking, the interpolator should have said "brings forth fruit" (פרה) instead of "puts forth leaf" (פרח). But he seems to have been influenced by Numb. xvii. 5 "the rod...shall *blossom* (פרח)," and he adds "nuts" from Numb. xvii. 8 "almonds".

[2] [706 *a*] Levy ii. 229 *b* "I saw in a dream that I had two *doves*" is explained "You married two *wives*."

[3] [706 *b*] Comp. (Levy i. 319 *b*) "*a descendant of* (גזע) ancient [people] (ישישים)," lit. a branch- (or ? stick) cut-off-from old-ones," somewhat like our "chip of the old block," "ein Abkömmling der Alten (d. h. Sohn

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL

Mother of the Lord, was bestowed by God." (It happens that this phrase "stump of Jesse" closely resembles another that in New Hebrew would mean "son of a *good old* stock," but in Biblical Hebrew "son of *aged* [ones]"; and the name "Jesse" itself is easily confused with words signifying "old man", "aged"; and some confusion from this source may have suggested the tradition, adopted by all three writers (and naturally commending itself to them), that Joseph was *a very old man*)[1]. The Protevangelium prepares us for this view of the dove by saying that Mary was "as if she were *a dove*" that dwelt in the Temple. Thus the first part of Isaiah's prophecy might be converted into a legend in connection with the marriage of Joseph to Mary and a story about a dove, saying "There shall go forth a *rod belonging to Joseph* the descendant of Jesse." This would naturally recall the story of the "rod" of Aaron, in which the Lord directed that all the tribes were to present "rods" in the Tabernacle and the chosen "rod" was to be manifested by a sign. Thus interpreted, "there shall go forth a rod" would mean that a rod would be caused to go forth, or given forth, by the priests in the Temple—as the rods were given forth by Moses from the Tabernacle. This would account for the first part of the legend as arising from the first part of Isaiah's prophecy.

[**707**] We pass now to the last part "*.....shall-bear-fruit and there shall rest* upon him (*or*, upon it)." "*Shall-bear-fruit*" is actually rendered by the LXX "*shall go up*". "*And there shall rest*" has been shewn to be confusable—and probably confused by very early Greek Evangelists—with "*a dove*". Thus we obtain "*There shall go up a dove upon*

ehrwürdiger Ahnen)." Note that Isaiah's גזע ישי, "stump of Jesse", is identical with the letters of the first portion of this phrase (גזע ישי(שים.

[1] [**706** *c*] The first mention of Jesse (1 S. xvii. 12) emphasizes his old age. "Jesse"=ישי, "aged man"=ישיש. (In 1 Chr. v. 14 ישישי is transliterated by A 'Ιεσσαί which is the regular transliteration of "Jesse").

him (*i.e.* Joseph) or, "*upon it*" (*i.e.* Joseph's rod). "Upon *him*" and "upon *it*" produce two or perhaps three versions. The Protevangelium, regarding the dove as the symbol of Mary entrusted to Joseph, represents the dove as alighting "upon Joseph's head"[1], *i.e.* "upon *him*". The Nativity says "on the extremity of the rod," *i.e.* "upon *it*". Pseudo-Matthew does not render עליו either "upon *him*" or "upon *it*". It probably read עלה "mount upward". At all events it makes the dove "fly up to the heavens." On the other hand, the Nativity approaches the canonical accounts by making the dove descend *from* the heavens and settle down on the rod. The confusion between על "upon", and עלה "go up", is frequent in LXX[2], and the corruption in Pseudo-Matthew has this advantage, that it tells the reader what became of the dove. But it is quite alien from the original symbolism in which the dove represented Mary.

[**708**] The reader should note that the last narrative—alone of the three—connects the production of a *flower* with the "rod", as well as the descent of a dove ("he whose rod should produce a *flower*"). This arises from its having previously quoted the prophecy of Isaiah according to the LXX,

---

[1] [**707** *a*] Protev. § 9, καὶ ἰδοὺ περιστερὰ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ῥάβδου καὶ ἐπετάσθη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωσήφ: there are many var. readings, *e.g.* D τῇ δὲ ἐσχάτῃ ῥάβδῳ ἐφάνη περιστερὰ καὶ ἐπέδωκε τῷ Ἰωσήφ. Perh. ἐπεστάθη should be read for ἐπετάσθη.

Whence does the Protevangelium derive its tradition that the dove flew "out of the rod"? It may come by implication from the Heb. which implies that the rod will "bear fruit", *i.e.* that fruit will shoot up miraculously from the rod, not however—as in the case of Aaron's rod—real fruit, but a dove. But it is also possible that the preceding word "from its roots" may be interpreted as meaning from the lower extremity, or point, of the rod (see above **699** *a*).

[2] [**707** *b*] "Upon him"=עליו, "go up"=עלה. Comp. Numb. xxi. 17 R.V. "spring up", lit. "go up", LXX "upon"; Is. xxi. 2 "Go up", LXX "upon me"; 1 S. ii. 10 "against them", LXX "go up". See **971** (vi).

which (mistaking נצר "branch" for נצה "flower")[1] has "*a flower* shall ascend from his root." But, with extraordinary inconsistency, the writer omits this miracle when he proceeds to describe the fulfilment of the prediction.

[**709**] There is abundant evidence that many passages in the Protevangelium are derived from Hebrew sources[2], and it would be possible to shew that variations in the interpretation of the meaning of "rod", and "root", of Jesse, some applying them to Jesus, some to Joseph, some (as Epiphanius quoted above) to Mary, may have originated other traditions, not only in this very early apocryphal work but even in Luke's narrative of the childhood of Jesus[3], and possibly

[1] [**708** *a*] Even the accurate Theodotion makes this mistake in Dan. xi. 7 "out of a *shoot* (נצר) from her roots shall one stand up," Theod. *ἄνθους*, "flower", LXX (correctly) *φυτόν*.

[2] [**709** *a*] For example, Mary is described as (Protev. § 10) *making a veil for the Temple of the Lord.* But a Targum (2 S. xxi. 19) says that *Jesse* (Hastings *s.v.*) was "*a weaver of the veil of the house of the sanctuary.*" Levy (i. 158 *b*) quotes the Targum as assigning this occupation to David, the descendant of Jesse, but how much more suitable for Mary!

[3] [**709** *b*] For example, after Mary has been described as twelve years old, she is brought into the Temple to receive materials for weaving the veil of the sanctuary along with seven virgins. But the "weaving of the veil" is explained by Jewish traditions mystically (Levy i. 158 *b*) of David and the counsellors of the Sanhedrim because they "wove the teaching of the Law." Is not Mary, with the virgins her companions, weaving the veil of the sanctuary, a parallel to the youthful Jesus at the same age of twelve, in the Temple, with the "doctors" *i.e.* the Sanhedrim (Lk. ii. 46) "both hearing them and asking them questions," *i.e.* weaving the teaching of the Law?

[**709** *c*] Again, Pseudo-Matthew says of Mary that (§ 6) when she was three years old "*she was* not *supposed* (putabatur) a young infant but *as it were* a grown up person *of thirty years old.*" "She was supposed" might=(in Greek) *ἐνομίζετο*: "as it were"=*ὡσεί*: "of thirty years old"=*ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.* Combining these three, we have, "*She was supposed as it were of thirty years old*" *ἐνομίζετο ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.* Probably no one who knows even a few words of Greek will deny that this is connected with Lk. iii. 23 "And he was [namely] Jesus, [when] beginning, *as it were* (*ὡσεὶ*) *of thirty years*, being [the] son, as *was supposed* [of] Joseph."

[**709** *d*] But what is the nature of the connection? Is it borrowed

in Matthew's and Luke's accounts of the Miraculous Conception. But these important questions must be discussed elsewhere. The point now to be insisted on is, that the whole legend of the Dove and Joseph's rod is assuredly based upon an interpretation—independent of the canonical Gospels—of Isaiah's prophecy about the "resting" of the Spirit; the interpreter taking "rest" as "dove". This affords strong confirmation of the conclusion previously arrived at from other evidence, that the same confusion accounts for "the Dove" in the Canonical Gospels.

[710] It may even be contended that the Protevangelium affords a tacit protest against representing the Supreme Being under the emblem of a dove. It appears to take as its basis an early verbal confusion between "*rest*" and "*dove*" in

straight from Luke and distorted? Or is there anything in O.T. about a descendant of Jesse that might originate this tradition about "*thirty years*", which Pseudo-Matthew might use to magnify the Virgin Mary as being "the root of Jesse"? The latter solution is suggested by the following passage, which—apart from genealogical tables, Levitical prescriptions, (and Gen. xli. 46)—contains the only mention of "thirty years" that occurs in the Bible (2 S. v. 4); (R.V.) "David was *thirty years* old when he *began* to reign." There is no "began" in the Hebrew, but R.V. has added it for the sense. Moreover the Hebrew for "thirty years old" is "*son of* thirty years." LXX has "son", thus: "*Son* (*υἱὸς*) of thirty years [was] David when he reigned (*ἐν τῷ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτόν*, lit. "in his having reigned," perhaps meaning "when he came to the throne")." As R.V. inserts "begin" for sense, so might a Greek Evangelist. It happens also that *ἄρχω* in classical Greek means either "*begin*" or "*reign*", and שרי, which in New Heb. means "*begin*", is very similar to שר "*ruler*". Thus, whether from Greek or from Hebrew corruption, or out of a desire to make sense, a tradition that David was "a son of thirty years when he reigned" might be converted to a tradition that "the son of David was thirty years old when he *began* (to reign)," and this might be regarded as applying to the Messiah.

(It may be worth adding that Pseudo-Matthew, who applies this saying to the female descendant of David, says afterwards that she was called "*queen*" in jest by her companions.)

This hypothesis would go far to explain Luke's extraordinary Greek, if Greek it can be called, and the extraordinary variations of MSS. and patristic quoters.

a famous prophecy of Isaiah, and to present a narrative shewing how the dove might be connected with the Messiah, the Rod of Jesse, in a manner quite different from that suggested in the Canonical Gospels, and more in accordance with the notions of the Jews. For there is nothing here inconsistent with Jewish symbolism. The dove does not come from heaven but from earth; it is not a sign of God's Spirit but of the pure Mary (the "dove" in New Hebrew frequently denoting a wife). The whole legend, in its earlier shape, reads as though it were written—or derived from something written—by a Christian Jew, who recognized that the Isaiah-prophecy had been misinterpreted by the Greeks. The author seems to say "There *was* a dove, connected remotely with the birth of Jesus. It did not rest, however, on the Messiah Himself, but only on the descendant of Jesse whose 'rod' was brought forth by the high priest, from the 'end' (lit. *root*) of which 'rod' the dove came. And the dove was not the type of the Spirit of God, but of the pure Virgin committed to Joseph."

§ 7. *"Resting", how interpreted by Justin Martyr and Tertullian*

[711] In the last section it was shewn how the legend of the Dove in the Protevangelium arose from a quotation from Isaiah about "resting" and "the rod of Jesse." In Justin's Dialogue, similarly, a mention of the "rod" in Isaiah introduces first a mention of "resting" and an explanation of it, and then a mention of the Dove. The transition is as follows: Justin has been attempting to find prototypes of the wood of the Cross in O.T. From the rods of Jacob and Moses and Aaron he comes to the rod of Jesse predicted by Isaiah in connection with the "resting" of the Spirit. When he has completed his instances, his Jewish adversary retorts by quoting the Isaiah passage at full length

concerning the "rod" and the "resting" of the Spirit, and by asking, How could Christ be pre-existent God, since he needed thus to be filled with the powers of the Spirit as if he were in want of them?

[**712**] Justin meets this objection by availing himself of the double meaning of the Greek "I rest" "I make cessation" (*ἀναπαύομαι*), which means etymologically "*cease*". (*Tryph.* § 87): "The Scripture says that these enumerated powers of the Spirit have come on Him, not because He stood in need of them, but because they were destined to *make cessation* on Him,—that is, find their *end or goal* (*πέρας*) on Him, *so that there might be no longer prophets in your nation in the old manner*....Therefore [the Spirit] *made cessation, that is, ceased*[1]": and he goes on to say that these powers "ceased" from the Jews in order that having obtained "cessation" in Christ they might reappear in the form of spiritual "gifts" to Christians.

[**713**] Tertullian, adopting the same view, says that "When Christ was baptized,.....all the fulness of spiritual gifts went back [to its source] in Christ[2]"; that, from the time of the Baptism, "the entire operation of the Spirit of grace, so far as the Jews were concerned, ceased and came to an end[3]"; and carrying his materialistic view to its logical conclusion, he asserts that "even the celestial element that had been in John, the spirit of prophecy,—after the transference of the whole Spirit into the Lord[4]—so utterly failed that, whereas he had preached [Christ], whereas he had pointed out [Christ] at His coming, he afterwards sent to enquire whether He was the real [Christ]."

[**714**] These extraordinary arguments indicate a host of

[1] *Ἀνεπαύσατο οὖν, τουτέστιν ἐπαύσατο.*

[2] *Adv. Jud.* § 8 "retro...in Christo cesserunt." Otto (Just. Mart. *Tryph.* § 87 n. 6) proposes "cessarunt".

[3] *Marc.* v. 8.

[4] *De Bapt.* § 10, "post totius Spiritus in Dominum translationem."

early controversies about the "resting" of the Spirit, or the seven powers of the Spirit, upon Christ. They explain, in the first place, why John may have deliberately avoided the word "rest" and preferred "abide", and why he repeats "abide" twice, in the message from God as well as in the Baptist's account of what he saw. He knew, perhaps, that some controversialists (like Justin, only earlier) used the ambiguity of the Greek word "rest" in order to alter the meaning of the prophecy[1]. In the next place they afford an additional reason why Mark may have gladly preferred the corrupt reading "dove" to the true reading "rest", because the latter—being applied to the "resting" of the spirit of Moses on the Seventy Elders and the spirit of Elijah on Elisha[2]—may have seemed to him to suggest that Christ was "in need" of the descent of the Spirit, and indeed that He was not Christ, but only Jesus, till the Spirit descended.

[**715**] In the third place they shew why Justin did not insert in his account of the Baptism anything that resembles John's twice repeated statement that the Spirit "abode" on Jesus, though it substantially represents the meaning of Isaiah's "resting", which Justin repeatedly connects with the Baptism. Probably Justin did not accept John as an authoritative Evangelist; but that does not prevent him from occasionally inserting traditions akin to John's. Here, however, in all probability, he omits the Johannine tradition

[1] It should be added that the Heb. verb itself, in the causative form, means "cause to rest", "let rest", "let alone", and hence sometimes "leave", "abandon" (Gesen. 629 *a*).

[2] [**714** *a*] Gesen. (628 *a*) gives only three instances of "Spirit" "resting (נוח)", "Spirit of יי (*i.e.* Jehovah) Numb. xi. 25–6 (E), Is. xi. 2; spirit of Elijah 2 K. ii. 15." But see Numb. xi. 25–6 "The Lord came down in a cloud and spake unto *him* (*i.e.* Moses) and took of *the spirit that was upon him* (i.e. *Moses*) and gave [it] (*i.e.* placed it) upon the seventy elders, and it came to pass that when *the spirit* rested on them they prophesied... and *the spirit* rested upon them." Would it not be more correct to say that "the spirit of *Moses*" rested upon the elders?

because he prefers his own. The fact is, that Justin *does not wish to believe that "rest" means "abide"*. He desires to explain away the notion of "resting" by taking the word to mean "depart from the Jews", "come to an end", "cease".

§ 8. *Other circumstances that might favour the introduction of the Dove*

[716] (i) We shall hereafter find (730) that in describing a supernatural Voice that came to John Hyrcanus, the well-known High Priest, Josephus uses the word *Voice* alone, where Jewish tradition has "*The daughter of Voice*"; and a common Jewish phrase to describe such a miracle is "There fell from heaven *a daughter of Voice*." Such an idiom, if used in a Hebrew Gospel describing the Voice that accompanied the descent of the Holy Spirit, might well perplex Greek interpreters. They might recall, as a parallelism, such passages as Job xxx. 29 "I am a brother to jackals and a companion to *daughters of the desert*," i.e. "ostriches"; and possibly they might have a vague notion of other later Jewish idioms such as "*Daughter of the Wine-mixer*," "*Daughter of the Burier*," to mean a wine-coloured dove (possibly called by the Greeks Oinanthé) and the carrion crow[1]. With these Jewish suggestions before them, Western translators would be all the more prone to think that "A *daughter of Voice* descended from the sky" must needs mean some bird heralding the Gospel or Good News of Christ; and what bird more appropriate than the one whose voice preeminently symbolized love and peace? They would accept "voice" as an additional rendering, but that would not displace the tradition, once implanted, of a dove descending from heaven. "A dove, *or* a voice, descended from heaven" would naturally

[1] [716 *a*] Levy i. 275 *a*, iii. 62 *a*, iv. 243 *b*. "Daughter of *the desert*" is Wetstein's explanation in Job xxx. 29; Gesen. (419 *a*) says "daughter of greed". The word (יענה) occurs only with "daughter".

become in the development of the tradition "a dove *and* a voice."

[**717**] (ii) Luke adds "in a bodily *form*." Possibly this addition was intended (**683**) to explain the "as" in "*as* a dove". It answered the question "In what way *as* a dove?" by saying, in effect, "Not in its way of flying, and not symbolically as a dove coming to its nest, but *in a visible appearance*." In any case his word "form" (εἶδος), in the LXX, represents thrice[1] a word that means also "fountain", so that it might explain the language of the Nazarene Gospel, which connects the Holy Spirit with a "fountain" (as also Tertullian does). But, further, this word "appearance", or "fountain", means (and by far most frequently) "eye". In Leviticus (xiii. 5, 37), "in *his eyes*" ought probably (Gesen. 744 *b*) to be "in its appearance (or, colour)," as later on (*ib.* 55)[2].

[**718**] A Hebrew Gospel might contain a marginal note "in his eyes", meaning "in the eyes of John the Baptist," and intended to shew that the vision was revealed to him and not to the bystanders. In that case, when "dove" was introduced by corruption, "in his eyes", when corrected slightly (by dropping a *yod*) so as to mean "in its appearance", might seem to make exactly the sense required:—"the Spirit *in his eyes rested* on Jesus" becoming "the Spirit *in the form of a dove* upon Jesus."

---

[1] Numb. xi. 7 (*bis*), Ezek. i. 16, viii. 2 (A), עין.

[2] [**717** *a*] That is, עינו should be read for עיניו. The Targums read "in its place". Comp. Deut. xxxiii. 28 "*the fountain of* (עין) Jacob," where Onk. has כעי, i.e. "*according to the likeness of*," and paraphrases thus (followed by Jer. I. and II.) "*according to* the blessing wherewith Jacob blessed them."

[**717** *b*] In the Talmud j. Ber. iv. 3, b. Ber. 28 *b* מעין ("likeness", "equivalent", "substance") when followed by "eighteen", was used to mean "the substance, or summary, of the Eighteen Prayers." Hor. Heb. ii. 147 says "This summary they called מעין, *a fountain*." The letters do mean "a fountain", but Hor. Heb. does not quote any passage to shew that this play on the word was customary.

[719] (iii) The Hebrew for "dove" is "Jonah". That "John" and "Jona(h)" could be interchanged we know from the fact that Peter is called (Mt. xvi. 17) "Simon Bar *Jona*", and (Jn i. 42) "Simon son of *John*". This suggests an extension of the hypothesis in (ii). The marginal note might be "In the eyes *of John*"; and this might originate, or support, a tradition that the Spirit manifested itself "in the appearance of *a dove*."

§ 9. *Conclusion as to the Dove*

[720] The Original Tradition appears to be best represented by the Fourth Gospel: the Baptist received from the Lord a message that one coming after him would baptize with the Holy Spirit, and that the sign by which he would discern his successor would be the descent of the Spirit. Evangelists connected their narrative of this with allusions to the resting of the Spirit of the Lord on the rod of Jesse as predicted by Isaiah. But, by a misunderstanding, the sign specially appointed for the Baptist, as a prophet—and recorded by him in the language usual to prophets ("I have beheld", "I have seen")—came to be regarded as a statement of a material and visible descent, which Justin, and probably Luke, regarded as "for the sake of men" in general, *i.e.* for the bystanders.

[721] Then arose the question among the non-Jewish Christians, how could the Spirit be thus made visible? At the same time, the Christians were pressed by opponents who urged that if the Spirit thus rested on Christ at a certain moment, He must have been without it before that moment. Up to that time, then—so heretics or Jews argued—He was not Christ, or, if Christ, not at all events a perfect Being. In answer to the question of visibility, the non-Jewish Christians were prepared to think that the visible emblem must be a dove, because of its Western associations, as introducing

a reign of divine love. A slight variation of the word "rest" in Isaiah's prophecy enabled them to substitute "dove". This was perhaps facilitated by various traditional errors as to the meaning of the Daughter of Voice, the Jewish name given to a Voice from Heaven. "Resting" being omitted, it might be urged (as by Justin) that the Spirit was in Christ before, and that "the dove", descending, was merely a sign for men[1]. But this tradition left a critic able to ask, like the Jew in Celsus, "Who saw the dove except the Baptist?" because none of the Synoptists say—not even Luke—that any one accepted Jesus as the Christ in consequence of this sign. Moreover, as in the account of the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and in the Protevangelium, "the dove" is, so to speak, left on earth—no one stating what became of it, whether it vanished, or whether it flew visibly up to heaven.

[**722**] Some of these discussions about ascending and descending—and, in particular, the Cerinthian theory that Christ descended upon Jesus in the form of a dove—John appears to meet indirectly, not in the actual narrative of the Baptism, but a little later on, where our Lord promises to the disciples a sight of the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man, as though to indicate that, even while He stands on earth, He is also touching heaven—expressed still more clearly (if we may accept the ampler reading of the text) in the words (iii. 13), "No man *hath ascended* into heaven but he that *descended* out of heaven, even the Son of man, who *is* in heaven"; and the invisibility of the regenerating Wind, or Spirit, is taught as a rudimentary truth in the previous context (iii. 8) "Thou knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth."

[**723**] But, apart from this metaphysical doctrine, John

[1] [**721** *a*] Irenaeus (iii. 9. 3) says that "the Word of God" took upon Him flesh, and, as man, received the Spirit of God to rest upon Him in accordance with Isaiah (xi. 1–2) or was "anointed" with the Spirit in accordance with Is. lxi. 1.

places his narrative of the Descent of the Spirit on a more solid historical basis than that of the Synoptists; and this he does in two ways. In the first place, he introduces it in the style of a prophet of Israel recording a word of the Lord, "Thou shalt *see*", and its fulfilment, "I *saw*". When a prophet—Isaiah, for example, beholding the Lord upon His throne—writes "I saw", no one of sense, and certainly no Jew of sense, would suppose that bystanders "saw" also. In the second place, without departing so far from the Greek tradition as to entirely omit "the dove"—which, after all, might be said in a manner to express the objective though not the subjective truth[1]—John omits all mention of it in the word of the Lord predicting the sign of the Messiah. He also adds—presumably as an essential part of the sign, since it is part of the word of God—something omitted by the Synoptists, namely, "abiding".

[**724**] As an epithet of the Spirit, "abiding" implies, in John, the Spirit of *Sonship* and *Freedom* (Jn viii. 35) "The bond-servant *abideth* not in the house for ever, but the Son *abideth* for ever. If therefore the Son shall make you *free*, ye shall be *free* indeed." The meaning appears to be (as in St Paul's Hymn of Charity or Love) that, in comparison with the free Spirit of filial Love, all other spiritual gifts that come from the Father are fitful and subordinate. Prophecy appears and vanishes, sonship abides for ever; and the presence of the spirit of sonship means the presence of reverent freedom and the absence of servile fear, so that (2 Cor. iii. 17)

[1] [**723** *a*] That is to say, the Spirit *was* a Spirit of Love and Peace, and the Dove *was* the fit emblem to represent the Spirit to the majority of Christians at the end of the first century, so that the vision might be called true objectively—*for the Church*. But on the other hand, it was doubtful whether any prophet of Israel, and particularly such a prophet as the Baptist, *could* at that time have seen the Spirit in the form of a dove, so that it was not true *subjectively*—for the Baptist. It was only true by anticipation, not true of what happened at the time.

"wherever the Spirit of the Lord is, there is *liberty*[1]." This divine prediction about the "*abiding* Spirit" subordinates the phrase "as a *dove*" in the Baptist's account of what he saw. But the epithet "abiding" also leaves no room for materialistic speculations; for no one would suppose that the form of a bird, visible to the prophet, "abode" on Jesus during the period of intercourse between the two. The meaning clearly is, that in some spiritual way it was revealed to the Baptist's vision that the Spirit, which came and went on the prophets of Israel, came to Jesus to "abide"[2].

[1] [**724** *a*] Comp. the curious connection in Clem. Alex. 113 ...ὁ δὲ ἐλεύθερος. Αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτιζομένῳ τῷ κυρίῳ... (see context). Iren. iii. 17. 1–2 speaks of the Spirit that descended on Jesus as identical with the Spirit mentioned in Ps. li. 12; but, whereas the Hebrew has "a *free* Spirit", he follows the LXX in its rendering ἡγεμονικῷ, "princely", principali.

[2] [**724** *b*] This opens up a question, profoundly interesting, but impossible to answer except conjecturally. Was the "abiding" of the Spirit an actual part of the vision revealed to the Baptist (perhaps under the influence of Isaiah's prophecy)? Or was it a subsequent detail imported from Isaiah's prophecy by Christian Evangelists? Thus much, at least, may be safely asserted, that "resting" in the Bible means sometimes the "rest" of Israel from enemies after their subjugation, so that it may imply conquering and triumphant liberty, as under Joshua (Deut. xii. 9 &c.), or glorious liberty as under Solomon (1 K. viii. 56, 1 Chr. xxii. 9); and the same Isaiah passage that begins by predicting the "resting" of the Spirit on the Messiah goes on to say (Is. xi. 10) "to him shall the nations seek and his *rest* (*i.e.* victorious kingdom) shall be glorious." Solomon (1 Chr. xxii. 9) is called "a man of *rest*," in this sense, and it is conceivable that the Baptist may have seen, in the Man on whom the Spirit was to "*rest*", a Deliverer whose "rest" was to be obtained through conflicts and victories.

[**724** *c*] It may be added that the same noun that means "rest" means also "resting-place", and indeed is thus rendered by R.V. in the last-quoted passage from Isaiah (xi. 10). In this sense, it is applied to Jerusalem and the Temple as the "resting-place" of Jehovah. Such a phrase as "the man of God's *rest*" might be interpreted by John the Baptist as the man who was to repeat the history of Solomon on a far vaster scale, giving Israel victory over the nations, and peace, and righteousness, but by John the Evangelist as the man *whose body was the Temple of the Holy Spirit.*

[724 *d*] Lastly—in view of above-suggested explanations of the Johannine tradition about "the Lamb of God," as possibly a paraphrase for "the evening sacrifice"—it should be noted that owing to an accidental identity of letters, the word "resting" or "resting-place" coming from "rest" (נוח), and the word "evening oblation" coming from "offer" (מנח), may both be represented by מנחה. In three cases, where the word means "rest" (or "resting-place"), it is rendered by the LXX "sacrifice" or "offering" (2 S. xiv. 17, Zech. ix. 1, Jerem. li. 59).

BOOK II

BATH KOL

OR

VOICES FROM HEAVEN

IN

JEWISH TRADITION

CHAPTER I

BATH KOL BEFORE THE GOSPEL

§ 1. "*Bath Kol*", or "*Voice from Heaven*"

[**725**] Bath Kol (*i.e.* "Daughter of Voice") was the name given by the Jews to a voice of a supernatural or providential kind, pronouncing judgments on, or directing, the actions of men. Such voices are mentioned both in the Jerusalem and in the Babylonian Talmuds as occurring frequently, and with especial frequency in the first century of the Christian era. The Jewish Rabbis and writers themselves appear to have been perplexed—as they well might be—by the problem of classifying different kinds of Bath Kol; and the verdict on its claims pronounced by the best of their teachers at the end of the first century seems to have been unfavourable.

[**726**] If the Synoptic Tradition was put together in some form about the time of the deaths of St Peter and St Paul, *i.e.* about 70 A.D., and the Johannine Tradition thirty or forty years afterwards, the writer of the latter might not be altogether uninfluenced, in recording any Christian instance of Bath Kol, by the changed opinion of the better Rabbis. By that time, or a little later, this miraculous agency was, as it were, put on its defence, and Jews sought texts of Scripture to justify belief in it (**778**). This fact, in itself, would naturally

lead us to inquire what there is in Biblical History that corresponds to Bath Kol. Even if there is nothing, the inquiry may throw light on the origin of the name, and possibly of the thing.

§ 2. *"The Voice of the Lord" in the Bible*

[**727**] The word "Voice" occurs in the Bible for the first time in Genesis (iii. 8) "And they heard the *voice of the Lord God* [as he was] walking in the garden ..... and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God." Schöttgen (ii. 439) takes this as meaning "thunder", and this is the meaning of "the voice of the Lord" throughout the 29th Psalm. The Latin version of Philo's comment on the passage deprecates a literalizing interpretation of "Voice" as well as of "walking". It is not, he says, by "a voice sent forth (voce missa)," *i.e.* external, that Prophets receive their message; for "a kind of Power [within them], *a more divine Voice*, soundeth the very words they utter[1]." This indicates a comparison, as early as the middle of the first century, between the prophetic faculty and the Voice of the Lord, to the (relative) discredit of the latter. In his context, Philo leads us to understand that this imputation of "walking" and "voice" to the Absolute would not have occurred to Adam and Eve unless they had previously "made themselves partners in deception."

[**728**] The Hebrew plural "voices" occurs twelve times in the O. T., and, though almost always rendered literally by the LXX, it always (except perhaps once) *means* "thunders". Generally the context makes the meaning clear, but it is not so in Exodus xx. 18 (LXX) "and all the people saw the *voice* and the torches and the voice of the trumpet," where

[1] [**727** *a*] *Quaest. Gen.* "virtute quadam vocis divinioris sonante vel ipsa dicta." Mangey would substitute "divinitatis" for "divinioris", but the text makes good sense.

R.V. has "all the people saw the *thunderings* and the lightnings and the voice of the trumpet[1]."

[729] There is no mention of Bath Kol in the Bible; but this association of "voices" with "thunders", and the initial use of the "Voice of the Lord" in introducing the doom of Adam, prepare us for finding an approximation to it in Daniel (iv. 31), where it is said that "a voice *fell from heaven*" to pass sentence on Nebuchadnezzar.

§ 3. *John Hyrcanus and Hillel*

[730] The first instance of Bath-Kol is connected with John Hyrcanus, High Priest about the middle of the second century B.C., and is thus described by Josephus: "An extraordinary story is told about the High-Priest Hyrcanus, how the Divine Power held converse with him. They say that on the very same day on which his sons joined battle with [Antiochus] Cyzicenus, he was alone in the sanctuary offering incense as High Priest and heard a voice, [saying] that his sons had just conquered Antiochus. And this he openly declared to all the multitude on coming out of the sanctuary. And so it fell out." Jewish Tradition—omitting such phrases as "an extraordinary story" and "is told" and "they say", all of which suggest incredulity felt or affected by a Jew writing for Greeks—says, "John the High Priest heard a Bath Kol which came out of the Holy of Holies and said[2]:

[1] [728 *a*] In defence of the LXX rendering, "voice", at all events in Exod. xx. 18, may be urged the parall. Deut. iv. 12 "Ye heard the [? a] *voice of words* but ye saw no form, only a voice." Cp. Jn xii. 28–9 "There came therefore a *voice* from heaven.... The multitude therefore that stood by and heard, said that it had *thundered*."

[728 *b*] Philo (i. 443, ii. 188) emphasizes the "seeing" (not "hearing") of the Voice from Sinai, as indicating that the Voice of God is seen by the soul's eye, see 781 *c*, *d*.

[2] Derenbourg, pp. 73–4, referring, in note, to *Midrasch-rabba* sur Cantique, viii. 7; j. Sota ix. 13; b. *ibid.* 33 *a*.

[730 *a*] The Jewish Cyclopædia (BAT KOL) quotes the passage thus

'The young warriors that have gone to do battle with Antiochus have conquered.' They wrote down the day and the hour, and, in fact, that was the day of the victory."

[731] Somewhat similar is the account given by Herodotus of the "Fame" that reached the Greeks at Mycalé encouraging them for the conflict with the tidings of the victory gained by their countrymen on that very morning at Plataea. A "Phemé", says the historian, "had flown into the whole of the army," and this word "flying into" he twice repeats, following the Homeric thought of Phemé as a winged and vocal goddess raising a sudden, common, and unanimous cry among the multitude[1]. So, on the morning of the taking of

(ii. 590 *b*) "The youth who had proceeded against *Antioch* had obtained a victory"; and this is the reading of the Talmud and the Midrash. But as the battle was fought in Samaria, and as Josephus mentions "Antiochus", the latter is apparently the true reading, as Derenbourg contends, or, at least, the reading consistent with fact.

Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 3) uses "the old tradition that John Hyrcanus heard in the sanctuary a divine voice speaking in the Aramaic language j. Sot. 24^{b}; cf. *Ant.* xiii. 10. 3," in support of the theory of "the use of the Aramaic language in the Temple," because the words "the young...conquered" are written in Aramaic while the narrative is written in New Hebrew. We must, however, bear in mind that (1) Hyrcanus would necessarily utter the words in Aramaic if he wished to be intelligible to the multitude; (2) in the numerous instances of Talmudic Bath Kol given by Pinner (see below, **1090**) this is the only one where "*writing down*" is mentioned, and possibly the *very words uttered by Hyrcanus*, as well as the day and hour, might be registered; (3) as this (apart from fictitious Biblical instances) is the earliest instance of Bath Kol recorded in the Talmud, and as it was of the nature of "second sight" dealing with matters of history, importance might be attached to the preservation of the exact words.

Had a French or German Archbishop, during the crusades, heard a Voice from heaven announcing a defeat of the Saracens while he was officiating in a cathedral, and had he proclaimed it to the whole of the congregation, he might, and probably would, have used the language of the people, instead of Latin; but this would not prove "the use of the French or German language" in the cathedrals of the land.

[1] Herod. ix. 100—101. *ἰοῦσι δέ σφι φήμη τε ἐσέπτατο ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον .....ὡς μέντοι κληδὼν αὕτη σφι ἐσέπτατο.* The last two words favour the rendering "flew into the *army*" (not "into the *camp*").

the Bastille, "One idea dawned on Paris with the day..... and in each heart *one voice*, 'Go forth, and thou wilt take the Bastille'..... No one proposed: but all believed, all worked[1]."

[**732**] According to some accounts another Bath Kol was given to Simon the Just, reassuring the people in the time of a threatened desecration of the Temple. But the names and date are doubtful[2]. The story may possibly have been modified so as to refer to the desecration of the Temple by Caligula about which Josephus tells us that God made the imperial commands His own care, that is to say, He removed the Emperor by assassination[3]. But on this occasion the historian mentions no supernatural voice, although he repeatedly recognizes the hand of Providence in frustrating the proposal to introduce the Emperor's statue into the Temple.

[**733**] In both of these Jewish instances the Bath Kol differs from the Greek Phemé in that the former is said to have come to one man, and direct from "the Holy of Holies": but all three agree in merely referring to what has happened. There is no claim hitherto in Bath Kol (as also there is none in the Greek Phemé) to distinguish right from wrong or to direct man's action.

[**734**] The next instance of pre-Christian Bath Kol relates to Hillel who flourished about the birth-time of Christ, told thus by the Jerusalem Talmud: "The Elders came to the house of Gadia (*Bab.* Goria) in Jericho. And there came forth a Bath Kol and said, *There is among you a certain man*

[1] Quoted from Michelet by Grote, *History of Greece* (Part II., Ch. 42). He also quotes Herod. ix. 100—101.

[2] See Derenbourg p. 207 n. (and p. 446) quoting "*Midrasch Rabba* sur Cantique, viii. 9," on "l'oracle que Siméon le Juste entendit de l'intérieur du Saint des Saints."

[3] [**732** *a*] *Ant.* xviii. 8. 6 f., *Bell.* ii. 10. 1 f. *θεῷ δ' ἄρα ἔμελεν τῶν προσταγμάτων*. Hamburger (ii. 1117) makes the desecrator Ptolemy Philopator, but has to regard "Seleucus" as "irrthümlich für Philopator." Derenbourg p. 207 f. makes him Caligula.

worthy of the Holy Spirit; only the generation is not worthy thereof. And they turned their eyes on Hillel the Elder," and by the Babylonian still more emphatically, "There was given upon them a Bath Kol from the heavens, *There is here one who is worthy that the Shechinah should rest upon him as* [*on*] *Moses our Master, but that his generation is not worthy thereof*[1]."

[**735**] In both Talmuds this is immediately followed by a Bath Kol in similar words uttered on Samuel the Little who lived long afterwards. But the Jerusalem Talmud, a little further on, gives another Bath Kol at the same place, "*Two of those among you are worthy of the Holy Spirit, and one of the two is Hillel the Elder* ..... They cast their eyes on Samuel[2]," and then another, uttered at Jabneh, saying that two in the assembly were worthy of the Holy Spirit, of whom one was Samuel. The Talmuds also contain other repetitions of the Bath Kol on Hillel with several variations.

[**736**] This tradition is of interest because it somewhat resembles the utterance of John the Baptist about Jesus, "There standeth one among you whom ye know not ..... whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose." Some one in the assembly at Beth Gadia may have uttered the words in question, referring to Hillel without mentioning him by name, and the Elders may have unanimously accepted the saying as expressing the judgment of God concerning Hillel. This view is confirmed by the fact that the Tosephta Sota says of Hillel "*His contemporary teachers said of him*, 'He was worthy to become a partaker of the Holy Spirit'"—without mentioning this Bath Kol[3]. It is possible that the compiler of the Tosephta—who, as we shall find hereafter, is said to omit another Bath Kol of great importance in

[1] J. Sot. ix. 12 (Pinner, *Einleit.* p. 23 *a*), B. Sanh. 11 *a*.

[2] Abridged from Schwab vii. 344, J. Sot. ix. 16. His translation is generally diffuse and free.

[3] So at least it is quoted by Hamburger, "Hillel" ii. 412.

which Hillel's doctrines are supported against those of Shammai—may have regarded the tradition as embodying a doubtful and rather dangerous superstition[1]. At all events, if the writer had attached weight to the Bath Kol, we should have expected him to say "His contemporary teachers, *in accordance with a Voice from Heaven*, said &c." Note that the Jerusalem Talmud mentions "the Holy Spirit", the Babylonian "the Shechinah"; also the latter mentions "resting", whereas the former does not. These variations are illustrative of those in the Gospels narrating the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus.

[737] Another Bath Kol was uttered on Hillel when he "separated from his trading brother Shebna, in order to devote himself to the study of the Law"[2]: "There went forth a Bath Kol and said (Cant. viii. 7) Though a man should give all the substance of his house for love it (*or*, he) would be utterly despised"—which is hardly noteworthy except for its obscurity and indefiniteness as to place and ear-witnesses[3].

[738] In concluding this section we may add a story relating how Hillel, in his youth, desiring instruction and unable to pay for it, climbed up outside the window of the school of Shemaiah and Abtalion and sat there listening through a winter's night. In the morning he was found covered with snow and almost lifeless. It was the Sabbath, and the Law forbade a fire to be kindled. But "they brought

[1] On the date of the Tosephta and on its mixture of ancient and non-ancient tradition, see Schürer I. i. 130—133.

[2] Aboth i. 13 (n. 26, ed. Taylor).

[3] [**737** *a*] Pinner (*Einleit.* p. 24 *a*) represents Bab. Sot. 21*a* as misreading לי "for me" instead of (Cant. viii. 7) לו "for him" ("so wäre es *mir* eine Verachtung"). The Jewish Cycl. says (ii. 591 *a*) that "Shebna, who was engaged in business, supported him (*i.e.* Hillel), thinking they should share as well everything in common in the life to come. But a Bat Kol called out...." This seems to imply a rebuke to Shebna (like 1 Cor. xiii. 3 "Though I give all my goods to feed the poor...") rather than praise of Hillel.

him in and attended to his wants, saying, 'He is worthy that the Sabbath should be profaned for him'." Hamburger, relating the same story, says, "*There rose the cry from all sides*, 'Light a fire', 'Hillel is worthy, &c.'".[1] As a fact, Jewish tradition regularly sanctions the suspension of sabbatical rules for the saving of the life of any human being, not merely of the excellent. Hence perhaps the saying did not become a Bath Kol. But it shews how "*a cry from all sides*" might become "*they* said". Then "they", owing to a special Jewish usage, might be taken as "THEY", *i.e.* God, thus developing a human into a divine utterance[2].

[1] Taylor, Aboth i. 13 n. 26; Hamburger ("Hillel") ii. 401.

[2] [**738** *a*] Comp. Aboth ii. 3 "THEY reckon unto you reward as if ye had wrought" (with Dr Taylor's note on "the indefinite THEY which occurs so frequently in Rabbinic"). There the context shews that the pronoun must mean "the Powers of Heaven." So it does in Dan. iv. 31 "To thee THEY speak" (so Heb. and Theod., but LXX and R.V. "it is spoken")—specially important because it refers to a Voice from Heaven. Comp. Dan. vii. 5 "THEY said unto it, *Stand up*." In Dan. iv. 25, 32 "THEY shall drive thee" (R.V. "thou shalt be driven") there has been a previous mention of (Dan. iv. 17) "watchers" and "holy ones", *i.e.* "angels", which LXX inserts in iv. 32.

[**738** *b*] In N.T., the Jewish THEY has been altogether dropped by A.V. R.V. may perhaps be said to suggest it once only, in the margin of Lk. xii. 20 (Gr. "*they require thy soul*," where "they" cannot mean "men"), but R.V. text has "This night *is thy soul required of thee*." Probably THEY should be understood also in Lk. vi. 38 "THEY shall give into your bosom," Jn xv. 6 "THEY gather them and cast them into the fire" (comp. Mt. xiii. 41 "his *angels*, and they shall gather.....and shall cast them into the furnace of fire"); and possibly in Lk. xiv. 35 "THEY cast it out" (A.V. "*men*" in each case, R.V. "they" except in Lk. xiv. 35 "*men*").

CHAPTER II

BATH KOL IN FAVOUR

§ 1. *Bath Kol in the Targums of Jonathan ben Uzziel*[1]

[**739**] THESE Targums insert eight Voices from Heaven. Naturally the Targumist could not represent God in the narrative of the Pentateuch as quoting Scripture not as yet written. Consequently these Voices are not scriptural texts. They are always introduced with the words "from heaven" (inserted exceptionally by the Babylonian Talmud in the Bath Kol on Hillel and on Samuel, but mostly omitted by the Talmudists).

[**740**] The first of these is inserted to pronounce an acquittal of Judah and Tamar[2]: (Jer. I.) "And the Bath Kol fell from heaven and said, *From before me was this thing done, and let both be delivered from judgment*," (Jer. II.) "The Bath Kol came forth from heaven and said, *Both of you are acquitted in the judgment. The thing was from the Lord*."

[**741**] The next represents God as vindicating Himself against the children of Israel who murmur against Him more

---

[1] [**739** *a*] Jonathan ben Uzziel lived in the first half of the first century, and some authorities assign the Targums to that period. But see Schürer (I. i 156–7) who maintains that they were revised, or re-edited, if not composed, in the fourth century.

[2] Gen. xxxviii. 26 foll.

rebelliously even than the serpent, which did not murmur when its doom was pronounced. (Jer. I.) "And the Bath Kol fell *from the high heaven* and thus spake, Come, all men, and see all the benefits which I have done to the people whom I brought up free out of Mizraim. I made manna .....Yet, behold, the serpent .....": (Jer. II.) "The Bath Kol came forth *from the midst of the earth, and a voice*[1] *was heard from the heights*, See, all men, and listen and hear, all ye children of flesh. The serpent .....".[2] This is noteworthy, not only for the freedom with which, as in the *Paradise Lost*, words are imputed to God, but also because the second Targum appears to make a *Daughter of Voice*, or Echo, come from *earth*, but a *Voice* from the *heights of heaven*—a point that will demand attention hereafter.

[**742**] A third Voice "fell from the high heavens" to console "the fathers of the world," *i.e.* the elders of Israel, when they heard the curses pronounced on those who break the Law[3]. A fourth—the last in the Pentateuch—taking as its basis the Scriptural statement that Moses died "according to the *word* (lit. *mouth*) of the Lord[4]," says, "A voice fell from heaven and thus spake: Come, all ye that have entered into the world, and behold the grief of Moses the Rabban of Israel, who hath laboured, but not to please himself, and who is ennobled with four goodly crowns—" those of the Law-giver, the Priest, the King, and the Saint ("the crown of a good name")......"Therefore is Moses, the servant of the Lord, gathered in the land of Moab by the *kiss of the Word* of the Lord." Here it is important to note that possibly the Bath

[1] [**741** *a*] The Bath Kol is very seldom indeed described as a *Voice* (instead of *Daughter of Voice*). The Jewish Cycl. (ii. 588 *b*) says, "Here and there in the Talmud it is briefly called קול, voice (Sanh. 96 *b*, comp. Ta'anit 21 *b*; B.M. 85 *b* Rashi)." In Sanh. 96 *b*, the Voice is a doom on Nebuchadnezzar, and the simple noun might be used in accordance with the precedent of the doom recorded in Daniel (**729**).

[2] Numb. xxi. 6.

[3] Deut. xxviii. 15.

[4] Deut. xxxiv. 5.

Kol may not extend through the whole of the passage quoted. The last sentence, for example, seems to proceed from the Targumist, paraphrasing the Scripture. This illustrates a phenomenon that occurs more than once in the Fourth Gospel, where it is impossible to tell where the words of Christ, or of John the Baptist, end, and those of the Evangelist begin[1].

§ 2. *Bath Kol in Siphra, Siphri, and Mishna*[2]

[**743**] The principal importance of the utterance from Siphra is that it uses the phrase "Holy Spirit" instead of Bath Kol thus: "At the time when Moses poured the oil of anointing on Aaron's head, he was anxious and fell backwards, saying, 'Woe is me that I have committed an unfaithfulness in the matter of the oil of anointing.' There made answer to him the Holy Spirit (Ps. cxxxiii. 1): *Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity*[3]." Two treatises of the Babylonian Talmud are said to quote this, substituting Bath Kol for "Holy Spirit"[4]. The

[1] The four remaining Voices are from Targums on the Song of Solomon, Lamentations, and Esther.

[2] [**743** *a*] Siphra, and Siphri, in their original form, date back to A.D. 100—200 (Schür. I. i. 145), the Mishna to A.D. 200, but the Mishna embodies earlier documents (*ib.* 129). These instances are quoted from Pinner. See Appendix IV, **1078** foll.

[3] Pinner—who, in the Targum instances, frequently gives only the initial words of a Bath Kol—stops here. Presumably, the Voice implied or added Ps. cxxxiii. 2 "It is like the precious oil...," *i.e.* the oil that flowed downward was not wasted.

[4] [**743** *b*] Pinner, B. Horajoth 12 *a*, Kerithoth 5 *b*. In the preceding note he says that "Then answered the Holy Spirit" occurs four times in the Second Chaldaic Translation of Esther, and Bath Kol four times.

[**743** *c*] The Jewish Cycl. (ii. 589 *b*) has, "At three Courts of Justice the Holy Spirit beamed forth: at the courts of Shem, of Samuel, and of Solomon. At the first, a Bat Kol cried, *She* [*Tamar*] *hath been more righteous than I* (Gen. xxxviii. 26); at the second, *I am a witness* (Mak. 23[b] referring to 1 Sam. xii. 5); and at the third, *She is the mother* (1 K. iii. 27; Mak. 23[b]; Gen. R. xii., lxxv. et seq.)." But these passages

only instance in Siphri is "R. Eliezer said, A Bath Kol went forth through the camp a space of twelve times twelve miles and called aloud and said, *Moses is dead.*"

may mean that on three perplexing occasions the Holy Spirit illuminated an obscurity by *means of* the Bath Kol, not that the Spirit was *identical with* the Bath Kol. It should be noted that in the first and third of these passages the Bath Kol is represented as saying what, in our text, Judah and Solomon severally say. The writer seems to imply, "Judah and Solomon did not *really* say these words, *not at least of their own accord*; they were prompted by the Holy Spirit, which sent them a Bath Kol." This—at all events in the first instance—is the view of the Jerusalem Targums, which represent Tamar as confident that God will inspire Judah with the spirit of confession, (Jer. I., and simil. II.) "The Lord of the world will cause him [Judah] in his heart to acknowledge them [*i.e.* his pledges]."

[**743** *d*] It is at all events certain that the Babylonian Talmudist, in dealing with the three above-mentioned judgments of the Holy Spirit, takes words assigned by Scripture severally to Judah, the people of Israel, and Solomon, and asserts that they were not uttered by these speakers but by Bath Kol. "How", he asks in effect (Maccoth 23 *b*), "could Judah or Solomon have known this?" And he replies "Much rather did a Bath Kol teach it to them." As regards the Bath Kol in Samuel, he takes advantage of the Masoretic text (1 S. xii. 5) (R.V.) "The Lord is witness against you...*and they said* (lit. *and he said*) [he is] witness." The Talmudist proceeds, "'*And he said, Witness.*' How comes it to be written 'he said', whereas it ought to be [if 'the people' was meant] 'they said'? Much rather did a Bath Kol go forth and say, '*I am witness in this matter*'."

[**743** *e*] Compare J. Sota ix. 11 (Schwab ix. 6, vol. vii. p. 333) where the Mishna says that in Deut. xxi. 8 the words of the Elders end at "thy people Israel", and that the Holy Spirit adds the rest of the verse; and the Gemara actually attributes to the Holy Spirit the words (Gen. xxxviii. 26) "*and he knew her again no more.*" See also the Bath Kol on Saul, "the chosen of the Lord," **783** *a*.

[**743** *f*] If this view is correct, instead of saying (with Hamburger, ii. 93) that "several [of the Talmudists]" held the Bath Kol to be on an equality with the Holy Spirit, "with which they often interchanged it (Maccoth 23)," it would be truer—at all events about the instances in Maccoth—to say that in some cases where words of Scripture were regarded as uttered by speakers under special inspiration, and where it was difficult to distinguish them from the contextual narrative, they were said to be uttered by the Holy Spirit, or by Bath Kol, the meaning being "the Holy Spirit speaking through Bath Kol."

[**744**] In the Mishna there are only two instances. The first is, "Rabbi Jehoshua ben Levi said, Every day Bath Kol goeth forth from Mount Horeb and maketh proclamation and saith, *Woe to the human creation for contempt of the Law*"—interesting as shewing a completely subjective view of Bath Kol. According to this, any Rabbi might say that Bath Kol, or God, said anything—provided that it was Scripture, or Scriptural—at any suitable time and in any suitable place[1]. Such a Bath Kol as this reminds one of that "saying" of the Lord which preceded the Deluge, "And the Lord said, *My spirit shall not always strive with man.*" The writer perhaps meant here, by "said", little more than we should mean if we said "The Lord *purposed*", and was as innocent as R. Jehoshua of any intention to assert that these precise words of God were ever made terrestrially audible to any human being.

[**745**] The next instance is of an entirely different nature, and it is the most perplexing of all the instances in the two Talmuds; for it concerns the remarriage of a woman where the husband has been supposed, but not proved, to be dead; and the Mishna allows her to remarry on the evidence of a Bath Kol, as follows: "A woman is allowed to marry on the evidence of a Bath Kol. It has come to pass that one[2] has stood on the top of the mountain and has said, *The man N., son of N., from the place N., is dead.* [Men] have gone and found no man there [*i.e.* on the mountain], and his wife has been allowed to remarry. And again it has come to pass in

---

[1] [**744** *a*] This freedom might be facilitated by the Hebrew idiom of using "*say*" where we use "*say to oneself*", as in 2 S. xxi. 16 "And he *said* to slay David," i.e. "*said to himself* that he would slay," R.V. "*thought* to have slain."

[2] [**745** *a*] "One (אחד)". Does this mean an "angel"? Comp. Berach. 4 *b* "How is it known that this '*one*' (Is. vi. 6 "*One* from the Seraphim") means Michael? R. Jochanan said, 'I compare the word '*one*' with the word '*one*'," and he quotes Dan. x. 13 "And behold, Michael, *one* of the chief princes...."

Zalmon[1] (Schwab, Çalmon) that one has said *I, N., the son of N.—a serpent has bitten me and I am dying.* And [men] have gone and have not recognized him. The wife has been permitted to remarry[2] (**1080**)."

[1] [**745** *b*] צלמון, said (Levy iv. 194 *a*) to be the name of a place (elsewhere read צלמים). The sense seems to demand a place. Otherwise conjectures might have been based on the likeness of the word to צלמות "shadow of death" or "thick darkness", and צלם "semblance" (Ps. xxxix. 6 "man walks *in* (or, *as*) *a mere semblance* (בצלם)"). "Zalmon" occurs in O.T. only in Judg. ix. 48 (LXX "Hermon" erron.), Ps. lxviii. 14, 2 S. xxiii. 28 צלמון (a man's name) = 1 Chr. xi. 29 עילי. Zalmon—called by Schwab Tsalmon, Çalmona, and Çalmon—is mentioned in Jer. Talm. Kilaim iv. 9, Masseroth i. 1, Orlah i. 2 (Schwab ii. 271, iii. 137, 319) as a place of vines or beans.

[2] [**745** *c*] This extraordinary enactment has received inadequate treatment from Hamburger who simply refers to it in a note thus: (ii. 92, n. 14) "A woman was allowed to remarry owing to Bath Kol, for example, if anyone had heard the echo of the cry of a man from the other side of a bank (von jenseits eines Ufers), *I am dying.*" This omits the fact that men "have gone and *not recognized* him," which Schwab takes as meaning that they find a corpse but do not recognize it as that of the husband.

[**745** *d*] The Jewish Cyclopaedia says (ii. 588 *a–b*) "Nor is an echo referred to... the Bat Kol here is more probably the same as when a voice is heard and no man is seen." This is—to say the least—loosely expressed. The sense demands "no man is seen *and no man can be seen*," so that the circumstances imply (in the first of the two instances at all events) a supernatural speaker. Moreover, this comment does not explain how this—the only Bath Kol in the Mishna, with the exception of the one in the Aboth, and the only one (without exception) that has a legal application—was actually applied to domestic life. It would also have been interesting to receive some explanation of "Zalmon", or some admission that it is unintelligible, and that, if understood, it might affect the interpretation of the whole passage. All sorts of legal difficulties also offer themselves to the commentator as to the ear-witnesses required by Law. Is there any evidence whatever, in the whole of Jewish literature, to shew that a wife remarried on the strength of such a Bath Kol?

[**745** *e*] The author of Horae Hebraicae (i. 243), on Zalmon, quotes thus: "There is a story (say they) of a certain man in Zalmon who said, *I, N., the son of N., am bitten by a serpent, and, behold, I die.* They went away and **found him not**: they went away, therefore, and married his wife." He continues, "The Gloss is, 'They heard the voice of him

[**746**] The first part of the Mishna says, "It is permitted to attest what one has seen by the light of a lamp or of the moon," after which follows, "It is permitted to a woman to remarry &c." The comment on the Mishna begins thus, "R. Chanina said, R. Jonathan has taught me that it *suffices* (Schwab "suffit"), it is true, to have heard a voice on the

crying, and saying, Behold, I die; but they *found* not such a man in Zalmon'." The reader will perceive that Horae Hebraicae translates הכירוהו (Pinner and Schwab "recognized") "found". That undoubtedly suits the circumstances better: but Levy gives no authority for this meaning.

[**745** *f*] The Original and Pinner's translation are as follows:— (Pinner, *Einleitung* p. 22) D. משנה Mischnah. יבמות Jebamoth, Abs. 16, Mis. 6:

משיאין אשה על פי בת קול מעשה באחד שעמד על ראש ההר ואמר איש פלוני בן פלוני ממקום פלוני מת הלכו ולא מצאו שם אדם והשיאו את אשתו ושוב מעשה בצלמון באחד שאמר אני איש פלוני בן איש פלוני נשכני נחש והרי אני מת והלכו ולא הכירוהו והשיאו את אשתו

"Man erlaubt zu heirathen durch ein Bath Kol. Es ereignete sich, dass Jemand stand auf dem Gipfel eines Berges und sprach: Der und der, Sohn dessen und dessen, aus dem und dem Orte, ist gestorben, und als man hinaufging und Niemanden dort fand, erlaubte man seiner Frau zu heirathen. Ein anderes mal ereignete es sich in Zalmon, dass Jemand sagte: Ich, der und der, Sohn dessen und dessen, bin von einer Schlange gebissen worden, und ich sterbe, und als man hinging und ihn nicht erkannte, erlaubte man seiner Frau zu heirathen."

[**745** *g*] Schwab (vol. vii. 218), in a very free translation, inserts words indicating that in the second instance the corpse was found and was no longer recognizable. That might be because it had swollen owing to the venom.

"Il est permis d'attester ce que l'on a vu à la clarté d'une lumière, ou de la lune; il est permis à une femme de se remarier, n'aurait-elle eu avis de décès que par une voix en l'air (un écho). Ainsi il est arrivé à quelqu'un, placé au sommet d'une montagne, de dire qu'un tel fils d'un tel né dans telle localité est mort; lorsqu'on parvint à ce sommet, l'on n'y trouva personne, et pourtant il fut permis à la veuve de se remarier. Une autre fois, il est arrivé dans la localité de Çalmon que l'on a entendu dire: 'Moi un tel, fils d'un tel, suis mordu par un serpent, et je meurs.' Arrivé près du cadavre, les habitants ne le reconnurent plus; et pourtant il fut permis à sa veuve de se remarier (par suite de l'audition de la voix en l'air)."

mountain; but *still it is necessary* ("encore faut-il") to have perceived the image ("l'image (pupa)") of a man[1]... On which R. Jonathan adds, '*It is necessary* at least to have seen an image (reflection) ("une image (reflet)") of a man'." Taken together, the Mishna and the serious comment almost force us to believe that in some parts of Palestine there must have been a gross heathen superstition about oracular voices from an unseen source, and that these were actually allowed to have the force of Law in special instances. Enlightened Rabbis in the first century—like enlightened commentators in the nineteenth—may have minimized it. But it appears to be of great antiquity; and it points to the conclusion that among the fishermen and peasants of Galilee, in the first century, Bath Kol was a factor in religious traditions or legends, as well as an occasionally determining influence in ordinary life[2].

§ 3. *Bath Kol expressing* (1) *celestial decisions*

[747] Belief in Bath Kol appears to be based on a belief that whatsoever is done by God on earth is done first in heaven: and the earthly phenomenon is a semblance, echo, or "daughter", of the heavenly reality. For example, "a certain mocker said to Cahana, 'What voice (voix) is there at this instant in heaven?' (What is being said above?)[3] 'It has just been decided,' said Cahana, 'that this man,' *i.e.* the interrogator, 'is condemned to death.' Another saw him and asked him the same question. The solution was the

[1] Are we to suppose that "*one has stood* on the top of the mountain" is supposed by Jonathan to mean that some man—or image, reflection, or phantasm, of a man—has been seen standing there?

[2] [746*a*] Hamburger (ii. 94, n. 7) says "Maccoth 23*a* wird der Ausspruch des Bathkol gleich der Aussage eines Zeugen betrachtet und darnach entschieden," but I cannot find the passage there in Goldschmidt's edition.

[3] J. Ber. ii. 8 (7), (Schwab i. 49).

same, exactly predicted." Cahana was a Babylonian, and he is mentioned in the Babylonian Berachoth more than four times as often as in the Jerusalem ; but the former does not contain these predictions[1].

[**748**] There is no prediction—nothing more than a vivid acknowledgment of the correspondence between the Voices of Heaven and phenomena on earth—in a story about R. Simeon ben Jochai and R. Eliezer his son who, after hiding themselves in a cave from a persecution that lasted thirteen years, come out and watch a fowler: "As often as Bath Kol said *Let go*, the bird escaped. As often as it said, *Despatch*, the bird was caught[2]. Upon which the Rabbi said, 'Not even a bird is taken without [the decree of] Heaven: how much less so many souls of men!'"

[**749**] From this view of a perpetual correspondence between the fates and fortunes of men on earth and the words of God in heaven, an inference might be drawn as to the words of Scripture. These might be regarded as uttered from the beginning in heaven and repeated there from time to time, with echoes on earth, as "oracles"—to quote the name often given by the Christian Fathers to Scriptural texts—for the guidance of mankind. Especially

[1] At least, as far as can be judged from Schwab's Index, which indicates 3 mentions in Jer. Berach. and 13 in Bab. Berach. But, in the latter, several of the references are wrong.

[2] [**748** *a*] Wetstein and Schöttgen (on Mt. x. 29) quote this (not quite identically) from Beresch. R. sect. 79, fol. 77. 4, which (Schürer, I. i. 147) is said to have been compiled in the sixth century. It occurs (Wetst.) in other Jewish post-Talmudic traditions.

The Bath Kol here uses Latinized Hebrew: "*dimus*" (Lat. *dimissus*) = "let go," "*specula*" (*i.e.* "do the work of a *speculator*") = "despatch" (Krauss).

But Pinner also quotes from the Jerusalem Talmud (Schebiith ix. 1) "He [*i.e.* Simeon ben Jochai] heard a Bath Kol which said, *Let go* (Pinner, "Man erbarme sich seiner"), and it was set free." The context does not mention (Schwab) the captured bird. But still the Talmudic passage indicates an early and possibly pre-Christian proverb—in view of Jewish reluctance to use Christian sources such as Mt. x. 29.

might this be the case when a text fell on the ear unexpectedly, or unusually, uttered without the least consciousness of the special application, *e.g.* by a child reading a Scripture lesson. This is like the comparatively modern use of *Sortes Virgilianae*; and probably the use of *Sortes Biblicae* is not extinct at the present time.

[750] Horae Hebraicae gives the two following instances (on Mt. iii. 17): "R. Jochanan and R. Simeon ben Lachish desired to see the face of Samuel [the Babylonian doctor]: Let us follow, say they, the hearing of Bath Kol. Travelling, therefore, near a school, they heard a boy's voice reading [in 1 Sam. xxv. 1] *And Samuel died.* They observed this, and so it came to pass, for Samuel of Babylon was dead."

"R. Jonah and R. Josah went to visit R. Acha lying sick: Let us follow, say they, the hearing of Bath Kol. They heard the voice of a certain woman speaking to her neighbour, 'The light is put out.' To whom she said, '*Let it not be put out, nor let the light of Israel be quenched*'."[1]

[751] In the first of these cases the Voice is a text of Scripture stating the death of the great Samuel, and the Daughter of the Voice, or Echo, is a repetition of it, a statement of the death of a lesser Samuel. The second is not quite so simple. Two women speak about putting out a candle. The utterance of the first, however, is not taken as a Bath Kol. But the utterance of the second, "let it not be

[1] **[750** *a*] Jer. Shabb. vi. 10 (Schwab iv. 78). The Jewish Cyclopaedia (ii. 309 *b*) quotes the last words thus: "Then they" [*i.e.* the two Rabbis] "said, 'It shall not go out, and may the light of Israel never be extinguished'." But Schwab ("non, dit-*elle*") supports Hor. Heb., and the sense seems to demand it. According to the principles (so to speak) of Bath Kol, or Sortes Biblicae, no man must select or alter a text. It must come upon him *by chance*, e.g. on opening the Bible, or hearing a child read it, &c. Dr Hermann Gollancz has been kind enough to give me the following translation of the last words: "She replied: The lights (*i.e.* the learned men) of Israel have not been and will not be extinguished." This seems to blend the words of the woman with the interpretation of the Rabbis.

put out," falling on the ears of the Rabbis who are hoping for the best and longing for a good omen, is regarded by them as a Voice from Heaven, conveyed under a version of a text of Scripture (2 S. xxi. 17 "that thou *quench not the light of Israel*"). Expressed more fitly the answer should have been, "*Let it not be put out*," which the Rabbis might interpret as meaning, "*Let not the Light of Israel be quenched.*"

[**752**] An extreme instance is that of the heretic Achar, who, when taken into twelve schools in succession, hears twelve school-boys read out his doom[1].

§ 4. *Bath Kol expressing* (2) *celestial judgments*

[**753**] In the last section Bath Kol expressed celestial decision rather than judgment—deciding, for example, that R. Samuel would die and R. Acha would recover, without judging the character of either. But deciding ran into judging in the cases of the mocker whose doom was pronounced in heaven, and of the heretic Achar condemned by twelve texts. And generally, we may say that the higher kind of Bath Kol, like the higher kind of prophecy, expresses celestial judgments, saying, '*This is right*', '*That is wrong*'.

[**754**] Obviously, it is of little use to call in Bath Kol to say *Right*, or *Wrong*, where all the world says *Right*, or *Wrong*, already. Hence we might be disposed to assume that its intervention would generally be required by some knotty point of morality: and this—if we set aside a number of Voices eulogizing particular Rabbis and perhaps springing from the affectionate hyperbole of their pupils—is generally the case. For example, Voices from heaven justified two Rabbis who had killed themselves for the sake of their countrymen—the object of one of them being to cancel an edict of persecution—and even sanctioned the non-observance of the Day of

[1] Chag. 14 *b*.

Atonement in the year of the consecration of Solomon's Temple[1]. And we have seen above that in the Jerusalem Targum a Bath Kol intervened to save the character of Judah and Tamar. On one occasion, says the Jerusalem Talmud, some people attending the funeral of an eminent Rabbi were disquieted by the arrival of the Sabbath, fearing they had profaned it. "A Bath Kol came forth, *Everyone who has not neglected to attend the funeral is worthy of the life to come, except the fuller.* When the man heard this he mounted his roof, threw himself down and killed himself. Bath Kol went forth, *Also the fuller.*" Experts may supply the obscure relations of the fuller and the Rabbi[2]: but it seems that the Bath Kol regarded the suicide as having purchased the future life by his penitent self-murder.

[**755**] As long as Bath Kol pronounced moral verdicts of this kind, which implied no comparison of one Rabbi with another, the utterances might pass comparatively unnoticed. But what if a Bath Kol pronounced a Rabbi in the right at the time when he was contending in argument against another Rabbi, who, by implication, must necessarily have been pronounced in the wrong? In such a case, the opposing Rabbi, or his pupils, might say that they had not heard the Bath Kol, or that it came from the devil. What they did say, however, was very different. The problem actually presented itself in a Bath Kol that intervened in a contest between the followers of Hillel and those of Shammai. It is recorded or referred to in both Talmuds and is important enough to take a separate section.

[1] [**754** *a*] Hamburger (ii. 94, n. 6) referring to Aboda sara 10 *β*, 17 *a*, and Moed katon 9 *a*. Comp. Jewish Cycl. (ii. 590 *a*) which says that in Shab. 30 *a* the latter Bath Kol is omitted.

[2] Kilaim ix. 3. Pinner says the fuller had worked all night and therefore profaned the sabbath without mourning for the Rabbi. Schwab (ii. 316) calls the man "le blanchisseur de Rabbi qui n'était pas venu en ce jour." This would seem to require that "except" (בר מן) should be rendered "but not" (like εἰ μή in N.T.).

§ 5. *The Bath Kol for Hillel against Shammai*

[**756**] This celebrated Bath Kol is introduced by the Jerusalem Talmud in a comment on the following Mishna: "'I was travelling', said R. Tarphon; 'and having bowed down to repeat the *Shema* ["Hear, O Israel" &c.] in accordance with the prescription of the school of Shammai, I was in danger of being taken by robbers [not having seen them in time].' The Sages said unto him, 'Thou didst sin against thyself, because thou didst transgress the words of the school of Hillel[1].'"

[**757**] Rabbi Tarphon, who flourished (Schürer I. i. 127) A.D. 100—130, followed Shammai, who enforced a bending attitude. Hillel allowed any attitude. One would have supposed that Tarphon's conduct, if faulty, was but slightly so. The Talmudist however in his comment regards the Rabbi's guilt as extreme because he contravened the words of the Sage, which are more authoritative, he says, than the words of the Prophets. A Prophet, he argued, needs a sign; a Sage does not. But then, in this case, there being a conflict between two Sages, there arose the obvious question, "What if two Sages disagree?" The reader will see below that the Talmudist assumes a last resort to Bath Kol:

[**758**] "Whereunto may be likened the Prophets and the Sages? To two couriers sent by a king to a province. With regard to one, he gives notice that unless he shews the royal seal and turban, he is not to be trusted: but with regard to the other, that he may be trusted without these tokens. Similarly, it is said with regard to the Prophet (Deut. xiii. 2) '*And he giveth thee a sign or a wonder*,' while in the latter case it is said, (Deut. xvii. 11) '*According to the sentence of the Law which they shall teach thee thou shalt do*'

[1] Jer. Berach. i. 7 adapted from Schwab's English translation p. 18 as being closer than the French to the original.

(herein consists their superiority). This however does not hold good unless a Bath Kol has made itself heard. Without that, if anyone would act strictly and adopt as rules the weighty opinions of Shammai and Hillel, he merits to have applied to him the verse (Eccles. ii. 14) '*The fool walketh in darkness*'; for these opinions are sometimes contradictory. It would be impious, on the other hand, to adopt the opinions of one or the other, choosing those which are the easiest. What then is to be done? To follow sometimes the easiest, sometimes the most difficult decisions of one or the other school—would not that be an arbitrary course? This applies only in so far as the Bath Kol has not been heard. But since it has revealed itself (il s'est révélé) for Hillel, the decisions of Hillel are Law, and the transgressor of them merits death."

[**759**] "The doctrine is[1], 'A Bath Kol went forth and said, *These and those*[2] *are the words of the living God, but the Halacha is according to the words of the School of Hillel.*' Where went forth the Bath Kol? R. Bibi, in the name of R. Jochanan, [said] 'In Jabneh went forth the Bath Kol.'"

[**760**] This long passage, or a part of it, is repeated thrice elsewhere by the Jerusalem Talmud[3]. The Babylonian Talmud reports the matter thus: "R. Aba said that Samuel said, Three years strove the School of Shammai with the School of Hillel. These said, 'The Halacha is with us,' and those said, 'The Halacha is with us.' There went forth Bath Kol and said, *These and those are words of the living God,*

[1] [759 *a*] "The doctrine is", תני: Pinner, "Wir haben die Lehre"; Schwab, "On a raconté", Eng. transl. "It has been reported."

[2] The last paragraph of this translation is quoted from Pinner as being more faithful than Schwab to the original. "These and those," *i.e.* the words of Hillel and the words of Shammai. "Halacha"= (Schürer I. i. 117) "the traditional Law".

[3] Pinner refers to Jebamoth i. 6, Kidduschin i. 1, Sota iii. 4. Schwab in two of these tracts omits, and in one, shortens it, on the ground of its having been translated before in Berachoth.

but the Halacha is according to the School of Hillel." From the account given by Grätz of this event it would appear that the two most celebrated Rabbis of the time were dissatisfied with this method of decision. It would seem to have been a chance utterance, like "Dieu le veut" in the stories of the Crusades, caught up by the majority and not really approved of even by those who approved of the doctrines of Hillel. At least such is the account given by Grätz, who calls the utterance a chance voice.

[**761**] "The Synhedrion of Jabne.....commenced with the fundamental propositions of Hillel and Shammai, in order to fix by voting such rules as should hold good in all cases. But it was not easy to obtain unity; for three and a half years the contest is said to have lasted..... Then a voice heard by chance (Bath-Kol), which was usually considered as a communication from heaven in difficult cases, is said to have sounded through the school-house in Jabne—a voice which said, 'The teachings of both schools are the words of the living God, but practically the laws of Hillel only are to carry weight.' Joshua, a man of calm disposition, alone expressed himself against any decision arrived at by the Bath-Kol. 'We do not require a miraculous voice,' he said, 'for the Law is not given for heavenly beings, but for men, who in questionable cases can decide by taking a majority, and a miracle cannot in such cases give the decision.' Eliezer was also not satisfied with the conclusion arrived at, but this opposition had only slight results[1]."

[**762**] In accordance with this feeling of dissatisfaction, and in striking contrast with the Jerusalem Berachoth, we find the Babylonian Berachoth mentioning the Hillelian Bath Kol indeed, but apparently in language of ironical deference, as not being entitled to suppress discussion. It first gives a long Mishna dispassionately enumerating points of difference

[1] Grätz (Transl.) ii. 340–1.

between the two schools. Then in the Gemara, or comment, it appears to incline towards the School of Shammai, but at all events seems to welcome argument, and continues thus:

"And the doctrine is according to the words of the School of Hillel; that is a matter of course, since a Bath Kol has gone forth. If you please, I say, 'It was before the Bath Kol.' But, if you please, I say, 'It was after the Bath Kol,' and it is as R. Joshua [would have it], who said, '*One does not take heed of* (or, *trouble oneself about*) *Bath Kol*'." We shall presently describe the circumstances in which Rabbi Joshua uttered this much-quoted saying, which struck a fatal blow at the superstition: but one point for immediate consideration is the difference of the attitude towards it adopted by the two Talmuds. The Jerusalem Talmud reverences the Voice as a Law the infraction of which is punishable by death; the Babylonian hints, with some appearance of sarcasm, its assent to the famous saying, "*One does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol*[1]."

[1] [**762** *a*] (B. Berach. 51 *b*—52). The translation given above closely follows Pinner's version, "Und die Halachah ist nach den Worten der Schule Hillels, dies versteht sich ja von selbst! Denn es ist ja erschienen (נפקא) ein Bath Kol! Wenn du willst sage ich: Es war vor dem Bath Kol. Wenn du aber willst sage ich: Es war nach dem Bath Kol, und es ist wie R. Jehoschua, welcher sagte: Man beachtet nicht (אין משגיחין) das Bath Kol." Schwab's version is "L'avis de Hillel, dit-on, sert de règle. Cela ne va-t-il pas sans dire, puisqu'une voix céleste l'a proclamé? C'était peut-être avant cette proclamation *qu'il était utile de le faire savoir*, ou même après, et comme R. Josué dit qu'on n'a pas égard à cette voix céleste, *il a fallu ici fixer la règle*."

[**762** *b*] The words I have italicized in Schwab appear necessary to define the ambiguous "it" ("*It* was before the Bath Kol"). Those who refused to acknowledge the supreme authority of Bath Kol would say that, *even after its utterance*, the demonstration of the predominance of Hillel's doctrine over Shammai's was still necessary because "one does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol."

[**762** *c*] The Jewish Cycl. (ii. 591 *a*) quotes Jer. Talm., but not Bab. Berachoth, as mentioning the Bath Kol in favour of Hillel. It adds that "The Tosefta on the same question...does not mention a Bat Kol."

CHAPTER III

BATH KOL ON ITS DEFENCE

§ 1. *"One does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol"*

[**763**] THE origin of this celebrated saying is described by the Jerusalem and the Babylonian Talmud with great divergence, but with agreement on this point, that it was uttered on the occasion of a conflict before the Sanhedrin between R. Joshua [ben Chananya] and R. Eliezer [ben Hyrcanos]—who flourished between A.D. 100 and A.D. 130—in which it was finally settled that matters of Law were to be determined *not by Bath Kol, but by the vote of the majority.* This decision was based upon the Jewish interpretation of the words in Exodus (xxiii. 2) which we render "after a multitude to *wrest* [judgment]." The word rendered "wrest" means also "incline", and Onkelos, making a pause before "after", renders the words, "*After the many* (i.e. *in accordance with the majority*) *thou shalt fulfil judgment*," probably interpreting the words as meaning "according to the majority it [*i.e.* the balance, or decision] shall incline." The words are similarly interpreted elsewhere in the Talmud[1].

[1] [**763** *a*] Comp. Jer. Sanh. i. 4 (6) (Schwab x. p. 239), and especially *ib.* iv. 4 (*ib.* p. 266) where Moses says to God, "'Master of the Universe, Make me to understand the rule as to doctrine,' and God said (Exod. xxiii. 2) '*It must incline after the majority*'." Bab. Sanh. 2[a] agrees with Jer. Sanh. i. 4 (6) that, in criminal cases, the words mean "One must go by the strict majority [even of one] in acquitting—but not in condemning," for which a majority of two would be required.

[**764**] The two accounts are given below in parallel columns, because of their bearing on important questions affecting the criticism of the Gospels. The language is that of Rabbinical hyperbole. We are familiar, through St Paul, with the metaphor of "removing mountains"—the name "uprooter of mountains" being frequently bestowed on a Rabbi who could clear away obstacles from the path of the students of the Law[1]—and Luke (xvii. 6) has prepared us to understand "uprooting a sycamine" in the same way. But here we have R. Eliezer first uprooting a carob-tree, then making streams[2] run backwards, then shaking almost to the ground the pillars[3], or walls, of the school, and finally appealing to Bath Kol.

[**765**] The Babylonian Talmud begins scientifically from the origin of the discussion. The Jerusalem Talmud plunges poetically *in medias res*, beginning from the excommunication of Eliezer and then returning to the discussion that caused it.

[1] [**764** *a*] Bab. Sanhedr. 24[a] applies the title to Resh Lachish and R. Meir; Bab. Berach. 64[a] says that R. Joseph was called "Sinai" and R. Bar Nachmani "rooter up of mountains," and implies a preference of R. Joseph.

[2] [**764** *b*] "Streams", *i.e.* the waters of the Law. Eliezer's eloquence for a time seemed to reverse the current of tradition. Comp. Hershon Genes. Talmud p. 150 (quoting *Soteh*, fol. 49, col. 1, 2) "At the death of R. Akiva the *supports* (? pillars, or foundations) of the Law ceased, and the *fountains* of wisdom were stopped up."

[3] [**764** *c*] "Pillar" is a name frequently (**943**) given to a learned Rabbi (Schöttg. on Gal. ii. 9) and also (Gal. ii. 9) to some of the Apostles. Comp. Jer. Aboda Sara iii. 1 (Schwab xi. 208) "When R. Abahu died, the *pillars* of Caesarea *wept*," Moed. Kat. 25[b] (Levy iii. 661 *a*) "*dropped tear-drops*", which the Talmudists have taken as a miracle, though it merely means that the *principal men* of Caesarea mourned for him. So Samson prostrated the "pillars" of Philistia. Eusebius *De Mart. Palaest.* ix. 12 contains a similar error, describing "the *pillars* throughout the city...which began to distil as it were tear-drops."

[**764** *d*] If this were intended here, the meaning would be "the principal men of the Sanhedrin." But in Biblical Hebrew עמדים, lit. "standing", may mean (Gesen. 764-5) either "pillars" or "attendants". And that complicates the question. See below **771**.

Jerusalem Talmud[1]

"When on another occasion it was resolved (on voulut) to excommunicate R. Eliezer, the sages asked who would undertake to inform him of it. 'I,' said R. Akiba [one of the best of his pupils], 'I will go and let him know it [and comfort him at once].' He approached his master and said, 'Master, your companions excommunicate you.'

[766] "Without replying, R. Eliezer led him out of doors to a carob tree and said, 'Carob tree, if their opinion is right, be thou torn up'—but the tree was not torn up:—'If

Babylonian Talmud[2]

There is a Mishna (Keilim v. 10) which treats of an oven which R. Eliezer makes clean[3] and the sages unclean, and it is the *oven of a snake*[4]. What does this mean? Said R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel: It intimates that they encircled it with their evidences as a snake winds itself around an object. And a Boraitha states that R. Eliezer related all answers of the world and they were not accepted.

"Then he said: 'Let this carob-tree prove that the Halakha prevails as I state'—and the carob was (miraculously) thrown off to a distance of one hundred ells, and according to others four hundred ells. But they said: 'The carob proves nothing.' He again said: 'Let, then, the spring of water prove that so the Halakha prevails.' The water then began to run backwards. But again the sages said that this proved nothing. He again said: 'Then, let the walls of the college prove that I am right.' The walls were about

[1] [765 *a*] Jer. Moed Katon iii. 1 (Schwab vi. 321–2). The preceding sentences describe R. Meir refusing to submit to excommunication until it is justified by facts and arguments. The extract is translated from the French of Schwab, which is generally very free.

[2] [765 *b*] B. Metzia 59ᵇ, quoted from Rodkinson's Transl. p. 140 (Goldschmidt's version of B. Metzia is not yet (Feb. 1903) published).

[3] [765 *c*] "Keilim", כלים, called by Schürer (I. i. 125) and Schwab "Kelim", is a tract on household furniture and its purifying. Presumably R. Eliezer pronounced an oven clean in circumstances in which the rest of the Sanhedrin pronounced it unclean. Did the tortuous nature of the discussion give rise to the saying that the oven was made by "*Snake*"? or was it because the discussion introduced discord in the Sanhedrin like the serpent in Paradise?

[4] [765 *d*] The translator says, "The expression in text is the oven of *Akhnai*, which means in Chaldaic 'snake.' Thosphat, however, maintains that the man who made the oven was named *Akhna*."

Jerusalem Talmud

my opinion is right, be thou torn up'—and it was so:—'If their opinion is right, return to thy place'—and the tree did not return:—'If my opinion is right, return to thy place'—and the tree returned.

[767] "In spite of all these marvellous deeds, the judgment of R. Eliezer did not prevail. The reason is, said R. Chanina, that since the promulgation of the Law it was decided that the majority should prevail in every discussion (Exod. xxiii. 2). Was R. Eliezer ignorant of this principle and why did he persist in his isolated opinion? He insisted simply because they burned in his presence the things he had declared pure.

"Thus, it has been taught elsewhere, If an

Babylonian Talmud

to fall. R. Joshua, however, rebuked them, saying: 'If the Scholars of this College are discussing upon a Halakha, wherefore should *ye* interfere?' They did not fall, for the honour of R. Joshua, but they did not become again straight, for the honour of R. Eliezer [and they are still in the same condition].

"He said again: 'Let it be announced by the heavens that the Halakha prevails according to my statement,' and a heavenly voice was heard, saying: 'Why do you quarrel with R. Eliezer, who is always right in his decisions?' R. Joshua then arose and proclaimed [Deut. xxx. 12] 'The Law is not in the heavens.' [How is this to be understood? said R. Jeremiah: 'It means, the Torah was given already to us on the mountain of Sinai[1], and *we do not care for a heavenly voice*, as it reads [Exod. xxiii. 2]: "To incline after the majority".'[2] R. Nathan met Elijah (the Prophet) and questioned him: 'What did the Holy One, blessed be He, at that time?' (when R. Joshua proclaimed the above answer to the heavenly voice), and he rejoined: 'He laughed and said, "My children have overruled me, my children have overruled me."']

"It was said that on the same day all

[1] [767 *a*] Hamburger attributes the words to R. Joshua (ii. 94) "Sofort erhob sich R. Josua und sprach seinen Protest dagegen: 'Die Thora ist nicht im Himmel, wir achten nicht auf das Bath Kol'." So does Levy, quoting this passage (Levy, *Ch.* i. 112 *b*) "worauf R. Josua, 'man kümmert sich nicht um das Bath Kol,' Sanhedr. 11 *a* und oft," which appears to imply that the words are often repeated in Jewish tradition *as uttered by R. Joshua*. Possibly the utterance of R. Jeremiah in the passage bracketed by Rodkinson should stop at "Sinai".

[2] See 763 *a*.

Jerusalem Talmud

oven is composed of several compartments united by some kind of mortar[1] the oven remains pure according to R. Eliezer: the other Sages declared it susceptible of impurity.... This is what one names the Oven of Hakinaï.

[768] "A great wrong was wrought on that day, said R. Jeremia; for henceforth everything that Eliezer's eye perceived was burned up[2]:—to such an extent that if one half of [a portion of] wheat was seen by him it was reduced to ashes, but not the other half. The pillars (colonnes) of the school trembled [under the angry eye of Eliezer] 'What business have you'—cried R. Joshua—'with the matters that the scholars of the Law

Babylonian Talmud

the cases of purity, on which R. Eliezer decided that they were clean, were brought into the college and were destroyed by fire. And they cast a vote, and it was decided unanimously to *bless* him (to place him under the ban). The question arose, then, who should take the trouble to inform him, and R. Aqiba said: 'I will do so immediately, for one who is not fit for such a message may go and inform him suddenly, and he will destroy the world.' What did R. Aqiba? He dressed himself in black and wrapped himself with the same colour, and sat at a distance of four ells from R. Eliezer. And to his question: 'Aqiba, what is the matter?' he answered, 'Rabbi! it seems to me that your colleagues have separated themselves from you.'

"The rabbi then tore his garments, took off his shoes, and sat on the floor, and his eyes began to flow. The world was then beaten a third in olives, a third in wheat, and a third in barley. According to others, even the dough which was already in the hands of the women became spoiled. A Boraitha[3] states that that day was the severest of all days, as every place on which R. Eliezer had set his eyes was burned."

[1] "Si un four est composé de plusieurs parties creuses et qu'entre l'une et l'autre on met une sorte de mortier formant la jonction."

[2] [768 *a*] Comp. b. Shabbath 33 *b* (Pinner *Einleit.* p. 23 *a*) which says that when R. Simeon the son of Jochai and his son came out of their cave, "wherever they turned their eyes everything was burned up," *i.e.* they were as "a consuming fire".

[3] [768 *b*] Schürer prefers a different spelling (I. i. 133) "Such propositions as are borrowed from earlier times which have not been incorporated in the Mishna are called Baraytha, בָּרַיְתָא, '*extranea*', *scil. traditio.*"

Jerusalem Talmud

(compagnons d'études) discuss and dispute?' A Bath Kol (voix céleste) made itself heard and proclaimed the superiority of the judgment of R. Eliezer. 'The Law,' said R. Joshua, 'is no longer in heaven' [it is for us to interpret it after the manner of men (humainement)][1]."

[**769**] Modern historians dismiss this legendary narrative very briefly. Schürer simply says "According to later tradition, this" [*i.e.* estrangement between Eliezer and Gamaliel the President] "would be explained by the fact that Elieser was excommunicated by Gamaliel[2]," nor does the ample index to his history contain the word Bath Kol, nor has the Biblical Index any reference to the passage in Exodus interpreted by the Jews as referring to "the decision of the majority[3]." Grätz indeed mentions the Bath Kol in favour of Hillel, and R. Joshua's protest against it[4]; but our legend he thus condenses: "There was once a discussion about an oven of peculiar structure, which a decision of the majority had pronounced subject to become unclean like earthenware vessels. Eliezer, following a special tradition, did not wish to yield to this decision and acted in opposition to it; at Gamaliel's instigation, Eliezer was excommunicated."

[**770**] Yet both Talmuds mention this Voice from Heaven as well as the excommunication; and its historical basis seems to be little, if at all, less solid than that of the Bath Kol in

[1] [**768** *c*] After this abrupt termination of the narrative comes a protest of "R. Crispi, or R. Jochanan in the name of Rabbi," thus: "If I hear anyone express an opinion uttered in the name of R. Eliezer, I shall repeat it in his name in spite of the anathema."

[2] Schür. II. i. 371.

[3] [**769** *a*] See Schür. II. i. 334 "the majority of those distinguished for learning was the *decisive* tribunal," but the passage contains no reference to Exodus xxiii. 2.

[4] [**769** *b*] Grätz ii. 340 "Then a voice heard by chance (Bath-Kol) which was usually considered as a communication from heaven in difficult cases, is said to have sounded through the school-house in Jabne...." See **761**.

favour of Hillel. It is therefore worth while to ask whether both of them may not have been of the nature of that *afflatus*, or *furor*, which fell on the Greeks at Mycalé and has often fallen upon men since that day, making the multitude cry out—honestly or half-honestly believing in the cry—"It is the will of God," or "It is the voice of God and not of man." When this cry was raised in honour of Herod Agrippa, Josephus tells us—though Luke does not—that it was from the king's *claqueurs*[1]; but what about the officers of the Sanhedrin sent to arrest Jesus and returning to the Council with the words, "Never spake man as this man"? This was certainly not flattery, and might easily have been expressed (in Jewish idiom) so as to assert that a "Bath Kol went forth."

[771] If therefore we can find any evidence that a popular audience was admitted to the discussions of the Sanhedrin, and that these were likely to take part with Eliezer or against the President who excommunicated him, we can understand the rise of the legend of a Bath Kol, and even of one to which Eliezer may have appealed. And thus everything will be explained. For it has been pointed out that the appellation "oven of the snake" might be explained as derived from the Serpent that brought discord into Paradise: the waters of the Law which are "turned back" by Eliezer are the currents of tradition; the uprooted "carob-trees" are doubts and objections; the "pillars" are the leading men who incline at first to the side of Eliezer, then to the side of Joshua, and who are left (according to one tradition) half-way between the two, though assenting to the vote of excommunication under the pressure of Gamaliel. We merely want evidence of the presence of a popular audience who could cry "Never man spake as this man," or "This is the voice of God," in order to explain the Bath Kol, like the rest, in a natural way.

[1] *Ant.* xix. 8. 2.

[772] Now in the first place it must be noted that Eliezer's decision in favour of the purity of ovens would naturally be popular, as the opposite one might be inconvenient to many; and, generally, one cause of Hillel's popularity was probably the fact that he stood for freedom while Shammai stood for restriction. But in the next place we have definite evidence that at this period an audience was admitted to the discussions of the Sages, and an audience that regarded with great disfavour Gamaliel the Patriarch, the chief instigator of the excommunication. We learn from Grätz that Gamaliel had taken measures for limiting or selecting those who were admitted, but, in spite of this, they on one occasion broke out against his authority and he was forced to resign.

[773] "The Patriarch of Jabne made a rule that only such persons should be admitted to the school-house whose uprightness had been proved; and for this purpose he placed a porter at the doors of the school, in order to prevent the admission of those who were unworthy..... The precautions for admitting members and disciples met with opposition, which at first was only timidly expressed ... [Then follows an account of his excommunication of R. Eliezer, followed by an attempt to censure R. Joshua.] The school-house was full of people amongst whom there arose a tumult at this contemptuous treatment of a member who was respected and loved by the people. The opposition party took courage and gave utterance to their dissatisfaction. They called out to the Patriarch—'Who has not already felt thy severity?' The School was turned into a tribunal, and the college deposed Gamaliel on the spot from the dignity of Patriarch.

[774] "With his fall ended the regulations made by him. The porter was removed from the door of the school, to which *all could now gain unobstructed admission*[1]."

[775] From these considerations it would seem that the

[1] Grätz ii. 341–5. The italics in the last sentence are mine.

two "Voices from Heaven", the one for Hillel at Jericho, and the other for Eliezer at Jabne, were of the nature of *Phemai*, or *Voces Populi*, sudden outbursts of popular feeling, "This is the voice of God." In the former case, the Voice prevailed; in the latter—the hero being no longer the gentle Hillel but the irascible Eliezer, who may have seemed to appeal as it were to "the galleries" for support—it failed. And thus we can understand why R. Joshua is not alleged to have replied, in answer to Eliezer's appeal to Bath Kol, "I did not hear it. The Patriarch did not hear it. You say you heard it. But who supports you? *Who, besides you, heard it?*" If Joshua—like the Greek Celsus in questioning the story of the Dove at Christ's baptism—had asked this question, he might have been met with shouts from the non-voting multitude "We support him, we heard it." And so it may have come to pass that both these Voices obtained a degree of acceptance. The former is ironically half acquiesced in, and half disputed, by the Babylonian Talmud. The latter is not disputed by R. Joshua. He accepts it, but only for what it is worth; and that—in a case of Halacha—is nothing: "One does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol[1]."

§ 2. *Apologies for Bath Kol*

[**776**] Speaking of Eliezer's appeal to Bath Kol and its defeat as recorded in the last section, the translator of the Jerusalem Talmud says, "Thus, for Talmudism, the miraculous period was closed[2]." The close was perhaps rather more gradual than this: but still it cannot be denied that a

[1] [**775** *a*] The numerous instances of Bath Kol in the Talmuds do not appear to include a single one in which Bath Kol is clearly stated to be *subjective*, as the Voice from Heaven is said to be in Jn xii. 29, and Acts xxii. 9 (but the same voice seems to be regarded as objective in Acts ix. 7).

[2] Schwab, i. Introd. p. lxxii.

great change must have taken place in the attitude towards the miraculous Voice from Heaven. Not probably that it was disused; but the time had come to defend or apologize for it, to limit it, and later on to define it.

[777] It appears certain that from the date of the introduction of the term, Bath Kol must have been regarded by most as an inferior revelation. "Kol" means an inarticulate sound or "cry"—of an animal as well as of man. It stands therefore beneath "word", which implies reason. There is the same inferiority in the Greek φωνή ("voice", or "sound") to the Greek λόγος ("word")[1]. Thus both Greek and Hebrew would recognize the superiority of the Word of the Lord (which inspired the prophets) to the Voice of the Lord, and still more to the Daughter of the Voice. No doubt, in passages from what may be called the Hillelite sections of the Jerusalem Talmud, and from other exceptional sources, Bath Kol is hyperbolically extolled. But, as we have seen Philo above (**727**) teaching the inferiority of the Voice of the Lord to the prophetic faculty, *i.e.* the Word of the Lord, so in later days, the Babylonian Talmud says "After the death of the last prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, the Holy Spirit departed from Israel but they still used Bath Kol[2]." This implies inferiority and makeshift in the time of decadence. In the same spirit—scarcely veiling a sarcasm under a playful allusion to feminine talkativeness—R. Jochanan stipulates that if Bath Kol is to have authority, it must be a woman's voice in the wilderness, but a man's voice in town (where women will not usually let a man speak)[3].

[1] See Ignat. Rom. ii. (Lightf.).

[2] [777 *a*] Jewish Cycl. (ii. 589 *b*) "'The Bat Kol was yet heard.' Tos. Sotah, xiii. 2, where משמיעין is nearer the original than Sotah 48 *b*, Sanh. 11 *a* משתמשין." The above is quoted from Sanh. (Hor. Heb. Mt. iii. 17) "but they used thenceforth the Bath Kol." But Goldschmidt (ואף על פי כן) "dennoch bedienten sie sich noch," Rodkinson "they were still used to a heavenly voice."

[3] [777 *b*] Comp. Jewish Cycl. (ii. 309 *a*) "But, says the Talmud, the

[778] The Jerusalem Talmud—which we have recently found asserting that the Bath Kol for Hillel had the force of Law to be enforced by the penalty of death—introduces the subject of personal guidance by Bath Kol in a comment on the following Mishna: "One may go forth [on a journey] carrying.....a fox's tooth, or a nail that has been used for hanging, to serve as a remedy. Such is the judgment of R. Meir (al. R. Josse). According to the other Sages it is forbidden even on ordinary weekdays as being a heathen custom[1]." The Gemara, or comment, after explaining the uses of these charms and the different opinions about them, passes to Bath Kol by saying that R. Eliezer ben Jacob interpreted the warning of Leviticus (xix. 26) against enchantments and augury in this sense, that "one is to take account of the omens and there must be three of them[2]!" The Talmud then adds as an opinion of "R. Eliezer"—which generally means the R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos above mentioned—that one may take Bath Kol as a guide where one is in doubt, in accordance with Isaiah (xxx. 21) "Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, *This is the way that ye should follow*[3]."

[779] Then come three instances in which a man escapes from a death that overtakes some one else in his place—in two of which the sufferer has kindly warned the survivor,

voice *must be an unusual* one, such as a man's voice in a city, or a woman's voice in a desert (Yer. Shabb. 8 *c*, Bab. Meg. 32 *a*)." This is not so accurately expressed later on in the same volume (ii. 592 *b* "Bat Kol") "It is said (Meg. 32 *a*) that it *sounds* like a man's voice...." The sense requires "that it *must* sound," if people are to take notice of it.

[1] Jer. Schabb. vi. 10 (Schwab iv. 77).

[2] "On en tient compte, et il faut qu'il y en ait trois."

[3] [778 *a*] So Schwab. R.V. has "This is the way, walk ye in it." The Jewish Cycl. says (ii. 588 *b*) "On this account [*i.e.* because no man was heard] Bat Kol was called a voice which is heard behind the back (Meg. 32 *a*)." The passage quoted above suggests that the name ("a voice...back"), if it was ever really a name, arose from the words of Isaiah.

and meets death through his kindness—and the survivor exclaims in the words of Isaiah (xliii. 4) "I will put a man in thy place"; and this heartless and selfish ingratitude is regarded as a Bath Kol! After this follow among other instances, those quoted above (**750**) "Samuel is dead", "The light of Israel shall not be put out," and then the Talmudist turns to astrology. The whole of the Gemara is well worth reading as a proof of contemporary superstition. Towards the end of it the writer mysteriously, but not inappropriately, remarks that the words of Balaam "there *is no* divination with Jacob" may be translated "there *is* divination with Jacob[1]." A Jewish recoil from such superstitions, after the destruction of the Temple, and after the famous defeat of Eliezer, may very well have affected the Christian Churches also, first in Palestine and then in the West, so as to cause a difference of attitude towards Bath Kol in the Fourth Gospel as compared with the Three[2].

§ 3. *Bath Kol as an Echo*

[**780**] The Jewish definition of Bath Kol given in the *Horae Hebraicae* is as follows: "The Bath Kol was this: When a voice [or, thunder] came out of heaven another voice *came out from it*[3]." "*Come out of* (or, *from*)" may mean, in

[1] [**779** *a*] The Talmudist himself explains how: "en lisant לו pour לא." The spelling of the two words is frequently confused (see Gesen. 518 *b*, 520 *b*), so that the dative of "he" and the negative may be regarded as often indistinguishable in Hebrew, so far as writing is concerned.

[2] [**779** *b*] Levy (*Ch.* i. 112) quotes (Kgl. iii. 38) a tradition asserting that "evil is not decreed by God directly (von Gott (unmittelbar) wird das Böse nicht verhängt) but is to be announced by a *Bath Kol*," but good comes "from His own holy mouth." Whether this applies to the post-prophetic period or not, it implies an inferiority in Bath Kol.

[3] [**780** *a*] *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. iii. 17) quoting Piske Tosaph. in Sanhedr. cap. i. I am informed by Dr Hermann Gollancz that the margin of this treatise has, "Bath-Kol: Some say that they did *not hear the very voice*

the Bible, "be born from"[1]; so that the definition suggests that the definer took the Jewish technical term to mean "daughter of the Voice [of God]." This seems to mean that when a decree is uttered in heaven, a reverberation or echo from it is sometimes heard on earth. An echo or reverberation, however loud, is always less loud than its original, so that it might be described as the daughter of the Divine Voice, not only as being its result but also as being, so to speak, smaller; just as "the daughter of a cistern" meant a small cistern attached to a large one[2]. Of course the phrase does not assume that *two* voices are heard *on earth*—one, the original and the other the echo. *One* voice alone is heard *on earth*. But that voice is the echo.

[**781**] Recently it has been maintained that Bath Kol means no more than "sound", or "voice"; but this does not appear to be proved[3]. And, even if "voice" could be shewn

---

coming from Heaven, but that *out of that voice another voice proceeded*, as it often happens that a man beats with force [sc. an object] and he hears another sound proceeding from it as from a distance: it was that sound which they heard, and therefore they called it Bath Kol." So, too, Pinner (Berach. *Einleit.* 24 *b*).

Professor Dalman does not quote either of these definitions in his article on Bath Kol.

The Jewish Cycl. has (ii. 592 *b*) "Tosafot Sanh. 11ª explains the Bat Kol as the sound of a voice issuing out of heaven"—which appears to omit the essence of the definition, unless "sound of a voice" is intended to mean "voice coming out of a voice."

[1] Gen. xvii. 6 "Kings shall come out of thee," and comp. Gen. xxv. 25, xxxviii. 28.

[2] [**780** *b*] Hamburger (ii. 92, n.) quotes Cholin p. 115, "בת בירתא Brünnlein, eine Cisterne die von einer andern gebildet ist: ebenso Midr. *r.* 2 M. Absch. 29 כאדם שיש לקולו בת קול."

[3] [**781** *a*] See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, p. 205 "Instead of the simple קל, later Jewish literature inserts the fuller ברת קלא, Hebr. בת קול, which however, means no more than 'sound, voice', though, as a rule, it causes the omission of 'the heaven'." A note adds "See my article 'Bath Kol'. PRE ii. 3, 443 f." The Article justifies the rendering "sound", as corresponding to the Syrian idiom, and quotes

to be the original meaning, and "daughter of voice" appeared to be a subsequent meaning read into the original by Hebraizing Rabbis interpreting a Syrian idiom—it would still be possible for Jews toward the end of the first century to *regard* the meaning as an "echo".

---

two passages. The first is, "Das Öl gibt (beim Giessen) keinen Schall von sich nach Schir. R. i. 3." But Levy (i. 275 *a*) quotes apparently the same passage more fully thus (Cant. r. sv. לריח) 6[e] "So wie das Oel (beim Giessen) keinen *Ton* (בת קול) von sich giebt, ebenso giebt Israel (wenn er leidet) in dieser Welt keinen Wehruf (בת קול) von sich." This suggests that in applying the word to "oil" the writer has in view the immediately following application to the sorrows of Israel in this world. If so, by reversing the sentence, we might interpret it thus: "Israel, when it suffers, gives forth *in this world* no *Bath Kol*, i.e. no *divine echo* to her cries" [such as the Martyr Akiba gave forth (see below **783**)]—"no more than oil gives forth a Bath Kol when it flows": that is to say Bath Kol, as applied to "Israel", would have its usual meaning, and the term would be applied to "oil" merely by analogy. In any case, a single instance of this kind cannot be taken as a proof that "Bath Kol", in itself, means no more than "sound". If that were true, we should expect to find, in the voluminous Talmuds and other Jewish literature, a great number of instances where it is applied to the cries of animals or of human beings. Until such evidence is adduced, the traditional Jewish view must hold the field.

[**781** *b*] The other passage is quoted by Dalman thus, "'Die Gottesrede vom Sinai war nach Schem. R. 29 ohne begleitenden Schall (בת קול), d. h. ohne Echo." Apparently this is quoted to shew that, in certain contexts, Bath Kol means "echo". If so, it is not to the point as an argument that the term may mean "sound". It may be added that Levy (i. 275 *a*)—who places both passages under the heading "Widerhall", "Echo"—gives the latter more fully thus: "(Exod. r. s. 29 Ende) If a man calls to another, [his] voice has a *daughter-voice* (Levy, "Widerhall"), but [as for] the voice that went forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, His voice had no *daughter-voice*."

[**781** *c*] Here again the author would perhaps not have applied the word Bath Kol to the echo of the human voice but for the antithesis with the echo of the divine voice. The saying seems to have reference to the parallel descriptions of the Voice from Sinai (Exod. xx. 18) "thunders", (Deut. iv. 12) "voice of words", and perhaps it is intended to negative some assertion that the Voice was an inferior revelation. Comp. Philo (i. 443) on Exod. xx. 18, "The voice of mortal creatures has as its

[782] Unimportant in itself, this question assumes importance for students of the Gospels, because of the contrast between the Synoptic and the Johannine Voices from heaven. In the two Synoptic Voices from heaven there is nothing that resembles, or approximates to, an echo. But the single instance given by John is of the nature of a celestial echo of a terrestrial prayer: the Son says "Glorify", and the Father replies "I have glorified and will glorify." Hence it is worth asking whether any similar repetitions meet us in Jewish literature.

[783] There are perhaps, in the Talmuds, only two or three[1] instances of an echoing Bath Kol. The first occurs in

criterion the sense of *hearing*, but the Scripture (χρησμοί) indicates that the words of God are *seen*, after the manner of light, for it is said, 'All the people *saw* the Voice,' not '*heard*'." Both writers appear to express the same meaning in different metaphors. This particular Voice from Sinai was not like other voices: it went straight to man's heart. It was, says Philo, like a flash of light. It was—says the writer quoted by Levy—like a voice that has no blurring reverberation. Compare Philo elsewhere (ii. 188) to the same effect.

[781 *d*] There were many traditions about "seeing the thunders" of Sinai. Levy (iv. 259 *b*) quotes Pl. Exod. r. sect. 5, 107[a] "the Voice went forth and was divided into seventy voices according to [the] seventy tongues [of the world]." Jewish Cycl. (ii. 592 *b*) refers to traditions ("Tan. on Deut. in Grünhut, Likkutim", v. 111 *b*, 112 *a*: "The word called from heaven") asserting that "the Divine Word of the Ten Commandments on Sinai was spoken with a strength that adapted itself to children, youths &c." All this was very natural, in view of the fact that the revelation was through "thunders", and might easily be assailed as an inferior revelation, just as, in John (xii. 29) some of the multitude say that the Voice from heaven is merely "thunder". Hence we can easily understand why Philo dwelt on the *visibility* of this particular voice, and why the later writer quoted above insisted that it had no Daughter Voice; *i.e.* the Parent Voice spoke, direct, to the heart of Israel.

[1] [783 *a*] B. Berach. 12 *b* "(2 S. xxi. 6) 'And we will hang them...in Gibeah of Saul, *the Chosen of the Lord*.' A Bath Kol went forth and said, '*The Chosen of the Lord*'," may be a divine *echoing* of the mocking words of the Gibeonites, indicating that (as the Rabbis believed) the king would be forgiven after death and would (1 S. xxviii. 19) rest with

the story of the martyrdom of R. Akiba—who was put to death by the Romans with tortures (after a long imprisonment beginning A.D. 135) for participating in the revolt of Bar Kochba or Koziba. When he was being led out to execution it was the time for reciting the Shema ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is ONE"), and they were combing his flesh with combs of iron; but he persisted in reciting it. His disciples remonstrated with him, saying that he had endured enough. Akiba replied "All my days I have been troubled about this verse, [Thou shalt love the Lord] *with all thy soul* (or, *life*), even if He should take away thy spirit (or, breath). When, said I, will it be in my power to fulfil this? Now that I have the occasion shall I not fulfil it?". As he was lengthening out the word ONE, till he expired at ONE, the Bath Kol went forth "Happy art thou, Akiba, that thy spirit went forth at ONE[1]."

Samuel in the grave. But the writer may mean that the Gibeonites stopped at the word "Saul" and that the Bath Kol *added* the rest (see the context). The same doubt applies to Maccoth 23 *b* (Pinner 24 *b*) referring to 1 K. iii. 27 and 1 S. xii. 5. See above **743** *d* foll.

[1] [**783** *b*] B. Berach. 61 *b*, and see Taylor on Aboth iii. 20. It is interesting to compare this with the account in the Jerusalem Talmud:

"R. Akiba was on the point of undergoing the extremity of the Law in the presence of the impious Turnus Rufus, when the moment arrived for reciting the *Shema*. He began it and it filled him with joy. 'Old man, old man,' cried the pro-consul, 'art thou a sorcerer (so that thy tortures cause thee no suffering) or dost thou defy me by shewing joy in the midst of thy pains?' 'Calm thyself', replied Akiba, 'I am neither sorcerer, nor mocker; but all my life long I have read this verse of the Pentateuch and sorrowfully said to myself, When shall I fulfil the three ways of worshipping God set forth in this profession of faith—*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy powers*? I have proved that I love him with all my heart and with all my means (moyens), but I had not yet undergone the test of love *with all my soul*, as I undergo it at this moment, and that is the moment in which I thus recite the *Shema*. I delight in this occasion of proving my faith; and I have shewn my joy." With these final words (en achevant ces mots) he gave up his soul [to God]. [[ ]]. Nehemi

[784] The second, quoted (like the first) from the Babylonian Talmud alone, relates to Rabba bar Nachmani; who is described as being of such super-celestial purity that "the heavenly college" desired to consult him on a question about which they were divided. So they sent the angel of death for him. He was alone in a forest, fleeing from persecution; but as he did not for an instant cease studying, the angel could not touch him. Presently, however, taking the noise of the trees to be the sound of the officers approaching him, he said, "It is better for me to die than to be taken by the Government." He was then questioned about the dispute in the heavenly college[1]. "As his soul was passing in peace, he said, *Pure, pure.* There went forth a Bath Kol and said, *Happy art thou, Rabba bar Nachmani, for pure is thy body and in purity* (lit. *at* [*the word*] *pure*) *hath thy soul gone forth*[2]."

Emsouni served R. Akiba 22 years and learned with him the interpretation of the most insignificant particles of the Bible (*also, only* &c.)" (j. Berach. ix. 7, Schwab i. 172).

[783 *c*] The passage is given in full in order to call the reader's attention to the fact that the Jerusalem Talmudist, while finding space for a record about a servant learning "the most insignificant particles of the Bible," omits the Voice from heaven, which, according to the Babylonian Talmud, should come in the place indicated by double brackets.

We could hardly have a more conclusive proof that—apart from the Bath Kol in favour of Hillel, and the Bath Kol to which R. Eliezer appealed—the Talmudic post-Christian Bath Kol about a Rabbi amounts to little more than a testimonial from the writer or speaker, meaning, in effect, simply, "This Rabbi was an excellent man."

[783 *d*] The contrast between the two Talmuds would be incomplete if we did not add that the Babylonian writer appends a comment of the angels on Akiba's fate and a second Bath Kol in reply to them.

[1] So far, the narrative is taken from Baba Metzia 86[a] as translated by Rodkinson vol. XII. 224.

[2] [784 *a*] "As his soul...forth" is quoted from Pinner (*Einleit.* 24 *a*). Rodkinson has "And when he was dying he was questioned about the dispute in the heavenly college, and he decided that it was pure. Then a heavenly voice came forth saying: Well is it with thee R. b. Na'hmani, that thy body is pure, and that thy soul left thy body while thou wast

[785] Without attempting to anticipate the results of a comparison between the Synoptic and the Johannine Voices from heaven, we may pause here and ask, What, if any, would probably be the difference of attitude toward Bath Kol in the middle, and at the conclusion, of the first century? And it seems reasonable to give—antecedently, and in strict subordination to facts hereafter to be ascertained—some such answer as this: Those Evangelists who taught in Palestine during the middle of the first century, with Hillel's memory fresh in their mind, would naturally be influenced by Hillel's precedent and by the popular belief. Recording, for example, our Lord's baptism in the Jordan near Jericho and the descent of the Holy Spirit, they may well have said, "Can it be that in this very neighbourhood in Beth Gadia of Jericho, Hillel was honoured by a Voice from heaven—although he did not receive the Holy Spirit but was merely pronounced worthy of it—and that our Master, on whom the Holy Spirit actually descended, was not similarly honoured?" On the other hand, an Evangelist teaching at Ephesus toward the end of the century—saturated, it is true, with Jewish tradition, but still writing for Greeks—might say, "Do not the better teachers among the Jews themselves now agree that such a sign from heaven as this cannot be allowed to decide what is right or wrong for men? Can celestial thunders or voices settle for us what teacher possesses, and what teacher

saying 'pure'." "At [the word] pure" is exactly parallel to "At [the word] ONE," in the story of Akiba's Bath Kol. The Jewish Cycl. has (ii. 591 *b*) "Happy art thou, Rabba bar Nahmani, clean in thy body, clean in thy soul."

Rodkinson continues "A *pitacium* (sic) (writing) fell in the city of Pumbaditha, 'Rabba b. Na'hmani was taken to the heavenly college'." Two other instances of πιττάκιον about the same man immediately follow. The word means "writing-tablet", hence "decree"; here "the decree of heaven." Levy (iv. 160 *a*) quotes this instance, but no other, of its "falling from heaven". It would be interesting to ascertain how the Jews differentiated a *pittacium* from a Bath Kol.

does not possess, the words of eternal life? Is a *voice*, or *cry*, of the Lord to be compared with the Word of the Lord? And if indeed the Lord ever seems to *cry*, is it not when a *cry* goes up to Him from one of His children and brings down an echo in the heart—which it is given to some to hear, but only to those who are prepared for it[1]?"

[1] [785 *a*] Of course other considerations besides chronological ones would influence the attitude towards Bath Kol. We have seen that the Jerusalem Talmud vehemently insists upon the legal force of the Voice for Hillel, but omits the Voice at the martyrdom of Akiba. The Babylonian Talmud acts reversely here, and the two Talmuds differ in their general attitude.

[785 *b*] Hence we cannot be surprised if the author of the second Petrine Epistle, though probably writing after the Fourth Evangelist, takes that view of Bath Kol which commended itself to the less enlightened Jews. Philo (727) places the Voice of the Lord below the prophetic faculty. The Petrine writer, without exactly comparing the two, represents the Voice at the Transfiguration as confirming prophecy, and perhaps implies that prophecy, without it, is a poor illumination: (2 Pet. i. 19) "And we find the prophetic word the stronger [for this evidence], to which [word] ye do well in attending, as being a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawn." Here, then, the difference arises not from circumstances but from motive and from individuality. The writer of the Epistle is far below Philo, and infinitely below the Fourth Evangelist, in spiritual sense.

BOOK III

VOICES FROM HEAVEN IN SYNOPTIC TRADITION

CHAPTER I

"BELOVED SON"

§ 1. *Canonical Traditions*

[786] THE Synoptists have:

(i) *The Voice at the Baptism*

Mk i. 11	Mt. iii. 17	Lk. iii. 22
"Thou art my *beloved Son*, in thee I am well pleased."	"This is my *beloved Son*, in whom I am well pleased."	"Thou art my *beloved Son*, in thee I am well pleased."

(ii) *The Voice at the Transfiguration*

Mk. ix. 7	Mt. xvii. 5	Lk. ix. 35
"This is my *beloved Son*, hear ye him."	"This is my *beloved Son* in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him."	"This is my *chosen Son*, hear ye him[1]."

In Luke's account of the Baptism, D has "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," a reading very strongly supported. It will be discussed below in the non-canonical traditions.

---

[1] [786 *a*] In these six passages, *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* (Lk. ix. 35 *ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος*) might be rendered "my Son, the beloved (Lk. chosen)." R.V. has, in Lk. ix. 35, "my Son, my chosen." SS. has, in Mt. iii. 17, "my Son, *and* my beloved."

[**787**] The variation of "beloved" and "chosen" in the Transfiguration may be illustrated by the following quotation from Isaiah in which Matthew appears to substitute "beloved" for "chosen":

Is. xlii. 1 (lit.)	Mt. xii. 18	LXX
"Behold my servant, I uphold him, *my chosen*, my soul is well pleased."	"Behold my servant whom I selected[1], my *beloved* in whom my soul was well pleased."	"Jacob [is] my servant, I will help him, Israel [is] *my chosen*, my soul accepted him."

[**788**] It will be observed that Luke alone has "chosen" in the Transfiguration. He also alone has it in:

Mk xv. 32	Mt. xxvii. 40, 42	Lk. xxiii. 35, 37
"the Christ the King of Israel."	"...the Son of God ...the King of Israel."	"the Christ of God, the *chosen*...the King of the Jews."

This last passage gives the impression that "Chosen" may have been in the Original as a name of the Messiah, and that it may have been variously paraphrased by Evangelists as "Christ", "Son of God", "Christ of God" &c. If so, Luke would seem to have conflated the Original with a paraphrase.

[**789**] In the same way (as is shewn by Westcott) in the Johannine version of the Confession of St Peter (Jn vi. 69), the Original Greek had a comparatively unfamiliar phrase "the Holy One of God," but it has been corrupted variously into (1) "the Christ, the Holy One of God," (2) "the Son of God," (3) "the Christ, the Son of God," (4) "the Christ, the Son of the living God." The last of these corruptions obviously

[1] "Selected" is intended to represent Mt.'s use of the rare word ἠρέτισα, instead of the common word "choose" (ἐκλέγομαι). If ἀρτίζω occurred in the Bible, it might be suspected that Mt. wrote ηρτισα: תמך, "uphold", never means "choose", but it = (1) καταρτίζω.

comes from Matthew's version of the Petrine confession, which should be compared with its parallels thus:

Mk viii. 29	Mt. xvi. 16	Lk. ix. 20
"The Christ."	"The Christ, the Son of the living God."	"The Christ of God."

[**790**] This shews how fallacious would be the hasty assumption that (Mk viii. 29) "the Christ"—merely because it is brief and simple—must be closer to the Original than the longer and more complex expressions of Matthew and Luke[1]. "Christ", and "Son of God", being familiar terms among Christians from the beginning, would tend to supersede the unfamiliar terms by which Jesus of Nazareth may have been called in those periods when He was not as yet recognized as Messiah, or when, though He was beginning to be thus recognized, the Messianic title ("Christ" or "Messiah") was not yet directly ascribed to Him, but only approximated to, or conveyed under a periphrasis, such as "Son of David," "Son of the Holy One (blessed be He)," "the Elect One," "the Elect of God," "the Holy One of God," "the Pure and Righteous One" &c.

[**791**] In the two Synoptic Voices from Heaven, the evidence, so far as it has gone, points to a suspicion—but not at present more than a suspicion—that, instead of "*Son*", the Original had "*Chosen*", retained by Luke alone, and only in the Transfiguration. But before coming to any conclusion we must consider the non-canonical accounts of the Baptism and the following questions. How came Matthew to mistranslate "my *Chosen*" in Isaiah? Are the causes that led him to do it such as may have led others to make the same mistranslation? Was "*Chosen*" ever a regular name for the

[1] [**790***a*] See *Corrections* (**415***a*) which compares Mk xv. 39, Mt. xxvii. 54 "a, or the, Son of God," with Lk. xxiii. 47 "righteous", and Dan. iii. 25 (R.V.) "a son of the gods" (A.V. "the Son of God") Theod. "God's Son (*υἱῷ θεοῦ*)" (prob. meaning "*a* son of God") LXX "angel of God".

Messiah? If so, why was it dropped by the Christian Church? Last, but as important as any of these questions, will come John's account of the Baptism, and the reasons why he omits the Voice, and the question whether his text contains any words (parallel to the Voice)—*e.g.* the Syro-Sinaitic version of Jn i. 34 "this is the *Chosen* of God"—that he may have taken as the correct original, misunderstood as a Voice from heaven by the Synoptists.

§ 2. *Non-Canonical Traditions*

[**792**] First, as to non-canonical traditions preserved by the early Fathers. Justin twice quotes the Voice in the form in which it is represented in Luke by Codex D and the best Latin MSS.: "Thou art my Son, [it is] I [that have][1] this day begotten thee." This is from the Psalms (ii. 7), and accordingly Justin mentions David as the original utterer. The words favour the views of those who maintained that Jesus did not become the Christ till He was spiritually born again as the Son of God, at the moment of baptism. Aware of this, and desiring to shew that Jesus was Son of God and Messiah from the beginning and not made so by baptismal regeneration, Justin endeavours to explain away the words "this day &c." by giving them a subjective and almost illusory meaning. The Voice, he says, is to be taken as "saying that His generation would take place *for men* from the time when their knowledge of Him was to begin." This is a strong proof that Justin knew of no other version of the Voice from Heaven.

[**793**] Again, Clement of Alexandria says "There resounded from [the] heavens on the Lord in the moment of baptism a

[1] [**792***a*] "[It is] I [that] have," expresses the emphasis conveyed in Gk by the insertion of ἐγώ, which would have been omitted if "I" had not been emphatic. It is also emphatic in the Heb. of Ps. ii. 7, "I [and no other]." For Justin's quotations, see Appendix I (**1035–6**).

Voice [as] witness to [the] Beloved, Thou art my beloved Son, [*it is*] *I* [*that*] *have to-day begotten thee*'."[1] He proceeds, "Let us ask of the wise, then: 'Being "*begotten-again to-day*", is the Christ [to be regarded as] now perfect, or—which would be most absurd—deficient?'" Clement's context, mentioning as it does "begetting", made it impossible for a scribe to substitute the canonical "well-pleased" for the non-canonical "begotten": and to this cause, *i.e.* contextual necessity, we perhaps owe the survival of "begotten", here, and in Justin. Augustine, it is true, merely admits that it is the reading of "some MSS. ..... though it is stated not to be found in the more ancient Greek MSS.[2]"; but the facts indicate that Justin cannot have known, and that Clement probably did not know, any other version of the Voice from heaven, and that this very early tradition was once in wide circulation[3]. Originally it may have been inserted because there was a lacuna, or an obscurity as to the precise utterance of the Voice from Heaven, and because the words placed by the Psalmist in God's mouth seemed applicable to the occasion. Then, when it occurred to many Evangelists that there was a difficulty arising out of the words "this day", since they would naturally be applied to the day of the baptism in Jordan[4], the Psalm-tradition was perhaps felt to be inapplicable. From this time, it would no longer be quoted, and the old quotations of it

[1] [**793** *a*] Clem. (113) Αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτιζομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐπήχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς ἠγαπημένου, Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἀγαπητός, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. It will be observed that he differs from Justin by inserting "beloved" (not however "*the* beloved", as in the Synoptists).

[2] Quoted by W.H. on Lk. iii. 22.

[3] [**793** *b*] Resch (*Agrapha*, pp. 347, 348) quotes this reading from the Acts of Peter and Paul, ch. 29; Methodius *Conviv.* viii. 9; the Homilies of Origen (on Ezekiel vi. 3); Lactant. *Inst. div.* IV. 15. p. 395; Juvenc. *Hist. ev.* I. 361 sqq.

[4] [**793** *c*] In Heb. i. 5, the writer may have taken "to-day" to mean as Philo (i. 554) "endless and inexhaustible time" equivalent to (Jn i. 1) "In the beginning".

would be suppressed, except where the context made suppression impossible[1].

[**794**] The Ebionite Gospel has "And there was a Voice from Heaven, saying *Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased*; and again, *This day have I begotten thee* ..... And again [there was] a Voice from Heaven to him [*i.e.* to the Baptist], *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased*." This attempts to harmonize Mark and Matthew by taking "beloved" to have been uttered twice—once *to* Jesus, and once *about* Jesus *to* John. Adding "This day have I begotten thee," it makes three utterances. All this however throws no light on the Original. It merely indicates uncertainty in the mind of the Ebionite author and a desire to omit nothing that had a fair claim to be authoritative.

[**795**] The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs has, "There shall come upon Him consecration *with a Voice as from a Father* (πατρικῆς), *as from Abraham the father of Isaac*, and the glory of the Highest shall be uttered on Him." The writer appears to regard the Saviour as devoting Himself in the waters of the Jordan to the sacrifice that He afterwards fulfilled in Jerusalem. This sacrifice he takes to be typified by that of Isaac. Jesus appears to him to be receiving from the Father the glorious appellation "my Son", as Isaac received it from Abraham (Gen. xxii. 7—8)[2]. The "glory" consists in filial obedience and self-sacrifice. This, while

[1] [**793** *d*] For the traditions of Celsus and the Sibyl see **563** foll. and **583** foll. The former (εἰσποιούσης, see L.S.) suggests that the Jew meant, not "beget" but "adopt", but it is doubtful. The Sibyl rather favours D's version, but the text affords very slight evidence.

[2] [**795** *a*] "Abram", *i.e.* "father-high", may have sprung from some Hebrew tradition about the Voice as coming from the "Father" in "Heaven", or "from on high". But it may have been suggested merely by the parallelism of the spiritual situation. In Gen. xxii. 7—8, Abraham twice calls Isaac "my son" while preparing to sacrifice him. The writer had in view perhaps some such traditions as we find in the Targums on Gen. xxii. 7 (Onkelos) (Etheridge) "And Izhak spake to Abraham his

dissenting from the version of Codex D, cannot be said to support by any direct verbal evidence the canonical version, but is not inconsistent with the latter.

[796] The Nazarene Gospel has, "My Son, in all the prophets I was awaiting thee, that thou shouldest come and that I should rest in thee. For thou art my rest. Thou art my First-born Son, who reignest for ever."

[797] The only passage in the Bible that connects the First-born of God[1] with the notion of reigning for ever is the Psalmist's description of the anointing of David and of the eternal covenant made with the king (Ps. lxxxix. 27–8): "I also will make him [my] *First-born*, the highest of the *kings* of the earth; *for ever* will I keep my kindness for him." In other respects the Psalm is appropriate as an illustration of the Baptism of Jesus. It describes the anointing of David by Samuel in accordance with a vision; the Gospel describes the baptism of the Son of David by the last of the prophets, which was also (as John tells us) in accordance with a message from heaven presumably conveyed in a "vision"[2]. The combination of internal evidence and antecedent probability makes it practically certain that the Nazarene Gospel is borrowing from the Psalm and is largely independent of any Hebrew Original from which the Synoptists can have

---

father, and said Father! And he said, Behold, *I am*, my son"; (Jer.) "And Izhak.....my Father! And he said, *I am*," i.e. "I am indeed *thy father* although I am to offer thee on the altar."

[1] [797 *a*] The only other mentions of the first-born of God in O.T. are Exod. iv. 22 "Israel is my son, my first-born," and Jer. xxxi. 9 "I am a father to Israel and Ephraim is my first-born." In Ps. lxxxix. 27, R.V. inserts "my" before "first-born": and this is justified by what precedes (*ib.* 26) "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father."

[2] [797 *b*] In Ps. lxxxix. 19, whatever be the reading, the reference must be to Samuel, guided by a "vision" to the anointing of David. That the Baptism was regarded as symbolical of the bestowal of *priesthood* (which implied a kind of "anointing") is indicated by Ephrem (p. 42) quoted above (575).

borrowed[1]. This independence indicates an early uncertainty and variation as to the words of the Voice from Heaven.

§ 3. *Negative conclusion: the Synoptic tradition probably erroneous.*

[798] Reviewing these remarkable deviations from the Synoptic Tradition[2], can we say that they point either to

[1] [797 *c*] The words "in all the prophets I *was awaiting thee*" may be based (like many other Jewish traditions) upon a paraphrase of Gen. xlix. 18 "For thy salvation *I have waited*, O Lord," words repeated thrice every evening by Jews at the present time in the prayer before retiring to rest (Jewish Prayer Book, p. 296).

[797 *d*] (1) The Hebrew has (Gen. xlix. 16—18) "Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel, Dan shall be a serpent in the way, an adder in the path that biteth the horse's heels, so that his rider falleth backward. *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord.*"

(2) Targum Onkelos: "From the house of Dan *will be chosen* and will arise a man in whose days his people shall be delivered....*A chosen man* will arise from the house of Dan...a [man] who will smite the Philistines with strength....*For thy salvation have I waited, O Lord.*"

(3) Targum Jer. I.: "From the house of Dan there is to arise a man who will judge his people with the judgment of truth.... A *chosen* man shall arise from the house of Dan.....Even thus will Shimshon bar Manovach slay all the heroes of Philistia.... When Jakob saw Gideon bar Joash and Shimshon bar Manovach, who were established to be deliverers, he said, *I expect not the salvation of Gideon, nor look I for the salvation of Shimshon; for their salvation will be the salvation of an hour; but for thy salvation have I waited and will look, O Lord; for thy salvation is the salvation of eternity.*"

(4) Targum Jer. II.: "(Of Dan) He will be the Deliverer who is to arise. Strong will he be and elevated above all kingdoms.... He is Shimshon bar Manovach.... Our father Jakob said, *My soul hath not waited for the redemption of Gideon bar Joash, which is for an hour, nor for the redemption of Shimshon, which is a creature-redemption, but for the Redemption which thou hast said in thy Word shall come for thy people the sons of Israel. For this thy Redemption my soul hath waited.*"

[797 *e*] The term "prophet" would include not only Samuel but also Joshua and other inspired Deliverers of Israel. The Books from Joshua to II Kings are called in the Hebrew Bible, "the former Prophets".

[2] In addition to these, Resch (Parall. iii. 21) quotes a Severian

the word "Chosen", or to any other, as a probable Hebrew Original, common to them and to the Synoptists? It must be confessed that we cannot find any such connection in the tradition of Codex D and that of the Testament of the Patriarchs. But it may be found conjecturally in the Nazarene Gospel, as follows.

[**799**] Supposing the Original to have contained the words "my Chosen"—in the Messianic sense in which the Jerusalem Targums have been shewn to use it, and in which the Book of Enoch will hereafter be shewn to use it—the Nazarene writer might naturally wish to define the term. "Chosen" might mean chosen to be priest, to be prophet, to be king; which of the three titles was suitable here? None of the three singly would express the writer's meaning; but he might find an answer that would imply the three collectively in the Psalm from which he has been shewn to be apparently borrowing, and which begins with the words (lxxxix. 1–3) "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord...I have made a covenant with my *chosen*, I have sworn unto *David my servant*." What is David "chosen" to be? In the first place a Deliverer, or Saviour, of the people, as the Psalmist implies later on (*ib.* 19–20) "*I have laid help upon one that is mighty;* I have exalted one *chosen* out of the people. I have found *David my servant*; with my holy oil have I anointed him." But David cannot be the Saviour of Israel except so far as he is the type, or son, of Jehovah, the real Saviour[1]. Hence the Psalmist continues (*ib.* 27) "I also will make him [my] *first-born*, the highest of the kings of the earth." This connection between "chosen" and "first-born" pervades the history and literature of the Hebrews and the Jews as mani-

Baptismal Service and another ancient document as having no more than "This is my beloved Son."

[1] This is implied in the preceding words (Ps. lxxxix. 18) "our king [belongeth] to the Holy One of Israel." The closest "belonging" is that implied in sonship.

festly and continuously as it pervades St Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Hence, if the Original contained "chosen" there is a fair amount of probability that the Nazarene Evangelist, following the line of thought of the 89th Psalm, would define the term as "chosen to be Son," or, to use the Psalmist's exact word, "First-born".

[800] This conjecture has at present—until it is supported by further evidence—only a slight positive weight. But it is useful negatively, as shewing that the Nazarene tradition is not incompatible with a fundamental tradition about "a Chosen One". And further, negatively, the dissent of the non-canonical traditions is very strong indeed against the recognition of the Synoptic tradition as historical. For, if that had been the original, why all these deviations? We could understand them if the Synoptic Tradition presented difficulties and if the Apocryphal Traditions removed them. But the truth lies in the contrary direction. Justin, for example, appears to be quoting the difficult uncanonical words "This day have I begotten thee" *because he knows no other version and feels that he must do his best to explain it away.* Taken collectively, these deviations suggest that the loose Jewish notions about the connection between a Bath Kol and some text of Scripture interfered at a very early period with historical accuracy—and even with a unanimous inaccuracy—in this part of the account of the Baptism. The authority followed by Justin and Clement of Alexandria certainly took as his source the Psalm about the "Son this day begotten," obscurely connected with David by the Acts[1] and also by Justin[2]: the Testament of the Patriarchs seems content with the simple phrase "My son", uttered by Abraham to Isaac on the way to Mount Moriah: the Nazarene Gospel

[1] [800 *a*] Acts iv. 25 *ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυεὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών* (where see W.H. note).

[2] See Appendix I (1035) *ἥτις καὶ διὰ Δαβὶδ λεγομένη ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅπερ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔμελλε λέγεσθαι, Υἱός μου* &c.

has been almost demonstrated to have taken its text from the Psalm describing the anointing of David, the "chosen", the "first-born, the highest of the kings of the earth."

[801] In the light of this evidence, it seems as though the Synoptic Traditions must themselves be regarded as nothing more than very early explanatory comments, attempting to define the Bath Kol and basing themselves upon the Isaiah-passage above quoted as being mistranslated by Matthew. It was there stated that Matthew substitutes "beloved" for "chosen". We must now consider why Matthew does this.

§ 4. *"Beloved", in Matthew, a mistranslation of "chosen" in Isaiah*

[802] Here are three translations of the passage in Isaiah:

Is. xlii. 1 (lit.)	Mt. xii. 18	LXX
"My *chosen* my soul is well pleased (or accepteth)[1]."	"My *beloved* in whom my soul was well pleased."	"My *chosen* my soul accepted him."

The Hebrew verb rendered "is well pleased" may be either followed by the Hebrew preposition "in" (comp. Matthew, "*in* whom") or treated as a transitive verb as in the LXX ("accepted him"). This varying construction of the Hebrew for "well pleased" may have influenced the interpretation of the Hebrew "chosen", as follows.

[803] The Hebrew preposition "in" is really absent from the Isaiah passage. It might however be easily supposed (erroneously) to be present, because the first letter of "chosen" (-בְּ) might be taken as meaning "in" (-בְּ). Matthew appears

[1] A.V. "*in whom* my soul delighteth," indicating by italics that there is no "in whom" in the Hebrew. R.V. gives no such indication.

to have taken it so, reading "my *chosen*" as "*in* my *beloved*"[1], so as to make the meaning "*in my beloved* my soul is well pleased" (instead of LXX "my chosen my soul accepted")[2]. Matthew's preference of this erroneous rendering would probably be stimulated by a dislike to call Christ God's "chosen" or "elect", because, among Christians, this name was common to all believers and not distinctive of the Messiah. On the other hand "only son" might seem to deny the sonship of Christians. But by using "beloved", he not only followed the regular rendering of the LXX for the supposed Hebrew, but also left the uniqueness of Christ's sonship suggested by the occasional use of "beloved son" in Greek to mean "only son"[3].

[**804**] On the hypothesis of the origination of the two Voices—that in the Baptism and that in the Transfiguration—from this one passage of Isaiah ("my chosen...*well pleased*"), we could explain how it happens that the original "Chosen" appears only in the Transfiguration. The erroneous "beloved" arose in Matthew (xii. 18), as we have just seen (**802–3**), from the words "chosen...*well pleased*", owing to the peculiar construction suggested by the italicized words. *If therefore those words were absent, that particular cause of error would be absent.* Now the words "I am well pleased" are present, according to all the three Evangelists, in the account of the

[1] [**803** *a*] This would imply his reading בחירי as ביחידי, an easy confusion. Strictly, יחיד means "only": but, when applied to "son", it is rendered by the LXX (6 times) "beloved", *ἀγαπητός*: see **811** *a*.

[2] [**803** *b*] Matthew's error may be illustrated by a converse corruption, which has probably made its way into the Masoretic text of Samuel (2 S. xxi. 6) "in Gibeah of Saul *the chosen of* the Lord." The speakers are proposing to hang Saul's sons, so that the phrase seems quite inappropriate. In the reading given by Gesenius (104 *b*), the first letter of "chosen" is taken as the preposition "in" or "on", and בחיר is read as ב הר, "on the hill". Similar confusions of ב may be found in 2 Chr. xx. 25, Ps. ix. 9, x. 1, Is. ii. 42 (Aqu.), Dan. xi. 33 (LXX).

[3] See note below (**811** *a*) on *ἀγαπητός*.

Baptism; and therefore all the three go wrong. *But in the account of the Transfiguration these words are absent*, so that this particular cause of error is absent there. It is true that Mark repeats in the Transfiguration the error that he committed in the Baptism; but that might arise from a new and very frequent cause of error, namely, the desire for consistency. And as to Matthew—who also repeats "beloved" in the Transfiguration—we may explain his mistake at once by the fact that *he* (*and he alone*) *interpolates in the Transfiguration the misleading clause* ("*I am well pleased*") *from the Baptism.* Luke, who omits in the Transfiguration the words that misled him in the Baptism, gives the rendering correctly in the former, "Chosen".

§ 5. "*Son*", *in the Synoptists, a mistranslation of* "*servant*" *in Isaiah*

[805] In support of the thesis that the two Synoptic Voices from Heaven are based upon Isaiah (xlii. 1 "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen [in whom] my soul is well pleased") we have been able to shew that "*beloved*" in the Synoptists may be a mistranslation of "*chosen*" in Isaiah, because Matthew has elsewhere (xii. 18) perpetrated this same mistranslation, and because there are special reasons for such an error in the Hebrew text of the prophecy. Again, Evangelists addressing Greeks might, according to Greek idiom, convert "my soul" ("*my soul* is well pleased") into "I", and especially where God is represented as speaking. Thus two of the differences between the prophecy and the Gospels are explained. But there remains a third, the most important of all—that the prophet mentions a "*servant*" whereas the evangelists mention a "*son*".

[806] This can be explained as follows. The LXX in the Isaiah passage renders the Hebrew "servant" by the Greek "boy". By this (according to their almost invariable

usage) the translators unquestionably meant "servant", as "boy" is sometimes used by Shakespeare[1]. But a Greek uninfluenced by the LXX would comparatively seldom use the Greek word in the sense "servant"; far more frequently he would use it to mean "boy" or "youth"; but in certain contexts (as we speak of "his dear boy", "my only boy", "her darling boy") it would mean "son", and this meaning he would naturally import—especially if he were a worshipper of Christ—into the words of Isaiah when applied to the Messiah. Having imported it, he would then proceed to make it clear by altering the ambiguous "boy" into the unambiguous "son" (*υἱός*).

[807] Such an alteration appears actually to have taken place in the LXX of Deuteronomy (xxxii. 43). Here the Hebrew has "He [*i.e.* the Lord] will avenge the blood of his *servants*." This was probably originally rendered by the LXX, as usual, "the blood of his *boys* (*παίδων*)," and subsequently, being taken to mean "sons", was corrected into "the blood of his *sons* (*υἱῶν*)," which now stands in the text without any various reading[2]. Such an error is in no way

[1] [806 *a*] "If thou seest my *boy*," *T. G. of Verona*, iii. 1. 257; "I keep but three men and a *boy*," *M. W. of Windsor* i. 1. 285 &c. Trommius gives only Prov. iv. 1, xx. 7, as instances of *παῖς*=בֵּן, "son", whereas it=עֶבֶד, "servant", about 320 times.

[2] [807 *a*] Ezra (ii. 65) gives the number of the congregation "beside their *servants* and their maids," and the LXX omits "and", but renders "*servants*" unambiguously, "*slaves*", *χωρὶς δούλων αὐτῶν παιδισκῶν*. But the writer, or editor, of the parallel Esdras, probably having before him a version containing the ambiguous "boys" instead of "slaves", appears to take it in the first instance as "boys"; and consequently, in order to make that meaning clear, he introduces a distinction of his own by telling us that *the rest were past boyhood*, which he expresses thus: (1 Esd. v. 41) "But they were in all, Israel *from twelve years old*—beside *boys* and maids—forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty." In the next sentence Esdras has to give the number of the "*boys* and maids", who, if they were the *children* of 42000, ought to have been a very much larger number than the one actually mentioned by Esdras, namely only

surprising; the wonder is that the instances of it are not more numerous[1].

[808] The Book of Wisdom, when describing the sufferings of the persecuted, probably has in view the persecutions of Israel by the Gentiles as typified by Isaiah's Suffering Servant. But the author, knowing perhaps no Hebrew, seems to have taken Isaiah's word, God's "*boy*", to mean God's "*son*". If he regarded it as meaning God's servant in the higher sense he might have used the word "attendant", θεράπων, which (807*c*) he actually applies to Moses and to Aaron. But he does not do this. He represents the persecutors as talking thus concerning their victim (ii. 12–16): "Let us lie in wait for *the righteous one*..... He professeth to have the knowledge of God and nameth himself *the Lord's boy* (παῖς).....and maketh his boast that *God is his father*..... If the righteous one is *God's son* (υἱός) He will help him."

7337! Consequently, he repeats "boys and maids" again, apparently intending the reader to understand them *now* as "*manservants* and maidservants".

[1] [807 *b*] The Hebrew עבד means (1) "slave", (2) "house-servant", (3) "servant (of God)". "Slave" is not given by the Eng. Conc. as occurring in O.T. except in Jer. ii. 14 "home-born slave", Heb. "child of the house."

[807 *c*] The LXX uses θεράπων, of Moses the "attendant" of God, in Numb. xi. 11, xii. 7, 8: and this—which occurs twice in Wisdom (x. 16, xviii. 21) of Moses and Aaron—has found its way into one passage of N.T. describing Moses (Heb. iii. 5). If the LXX had used this in Isaiah to denote the Suffering Servant, and elsewhere to denote Israel the Servant of God, there would have been no ambiguity. But the LXX never uses θεράπων in the Prophets (and only twice in the historical books after Joshua). In Exod. vii. 9—viii. 27 it repeatedly applies the word to the attendants of Pharaoh!

[807 *d*] The first use of παῖς in LXX is in Gen. ix. 25 "Cursed be Canaan, *a servant of servants*...," where LXX has παῖς οἰκέτης lit. "a boy inmate of the house." It is curious that in so strong a passage the translators did not use δοῦλος "slave". In parallel passages of Kings and Chronicles, or Ezra and 1 Esdras, παῖς and δοῦλος are frequently used according to the taste of the translator, to represent Heb. "servant" or "slave".

This is conclusive evidence that the writer took the Greek word, God's "*boy*"—which to the LXX conveyed the meaning, God's "*servant*"—as being practically identical with God's "*son*". The only difference, in his mind, was probably that "son" appeared to be somewhat more in accordance with an elevated style than "boy"[1].

[**809**] Coming to N.T., we find that in the Acts Jesus is four times called "*boy*" in connection with God[2]. This would seem at first sight to be obviously intended for "son". But Acts also calls David "thy (*i.e.* God's) *boy*", and this in the same context that calls Jesus "boy"[3]. Moreover Luke introduces a centurion as saying "my *boy*" about some one previously described by Luke himself as "*slave*"[4]. Again, besides twice using the plural as "servants", Luke speaks of Israel and David as the "boy" of God, presumably meaning servant[5]. Hence R.V. is justified in leaving it an open question whether "boy", in the Acts, means "servant" or "child" when applied to Jesus. A similar uncertainty, though in a less degree, applies to three instances in Clement of Rome[6].

[**810**] It is possible that some Jewish Christians, feeling that God's service is perfect freedom, may have clung to the old tradition that described Jesus—though greater than all

[1] [**808** *a*] He uses παῖς eight times elsewhere. In each case the meaning *might be* "child" or "children". In viii. 19, xii. 25, xviii. 9, 10 no other meaning is *possible*.

[2] Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30.

[3] Acts iv. 25, 27.

[4] Lk. vii. 7, vii. 2.

[5] Lk. i. 54, 69.

[6] [**809** *a*] Clem. Rom. § 59. The passage is Hebraic and emotional, passing from exhortation into a prayer or hymn. Lightf. says that the designation was taken from Is. xlii. 1 (Mt. xii. 18), "but the higher sense of υἱὸς was soon imported into the ambiguous word παῖς... and so Clement seems to have used the word here." "*Seems*" is all that can safely be said; but Prof. Dalman says (*Words of Jesus*, p. 278) "The rendering 'His (Thy) beloved child' is here obviously necessary."

the "servants of God", greater than David, Moses or Abraham—as delighting to make Himself, and to call Himself, "the Servant"[1].

[811] Still, for the Greeks at large, the title "*boy* of God" would be unseemly, if not repellent. It might be tolerated in Hebraic hymnal language, but not in historical narrative—especially when describing an utterance from heaven. Moreover, when "chosen" had been corrupted into "beloved" by the causes above-mentioned, the latter epithet would almost seem to require "*son*" instead of "*servant*". Lastly, "beloved *son*"—occurring as it does in the LXX thrice in a single passage, describing the sacrifice on Mount Moriah, and almost nowhere else—would harmonize with the general belief among early Christians that there was a parallelism between Christ and Isaac[2]. On the whole, the facts almost amount to a demonstration that a Voice from Heaven about the Messiah, containing the words "my *servant*", if originally expressed—as in Matthew's version of Isaiah—by the words "my *boy* (παῖς)", would speedily be converted, in most Greek Gospels, into "my *son* (υἱός)"[3].

---

[1] [810 *a*] Comp. Philipp. ii. 6, "Being in *the essential-form* (μορφῇ) of God... emptied himself, taking the *essential-form* (μορφὴν) of a slave (δούλου)." This is strong language in view of the context, "being made in the *likeness* of a man, and being found in the *outward-form* (σχήματι) of a man." The Apostle appears to imply that to be a "*slave*", i.e. servant of servants, was more "essential" to the divine Sonship than to be "a *man*".

[2] [811 *a*] Gen. xxii. 2, 12, 16 "thine *only* (יחיד) son," always τὸν (or τοῦ) ὑ. σου τ. ἀγαπητόν (-οῦ). The phrase occurs in LXX nowhere else except Jer. xxxi. 20, where "beloved"=יקיר. In Jer. vi. 26, Amos viii. 10, Zech. xii. 10, יחיד "only [one]"="only [son]", and is rendered "beloved" by LXX, which does not insert "son".

[3] [811 *b*] Tertullian (*Marc.* iii. 17, and iv. 22 *bis*), thrice quotes Is. l. 10 ("Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his *servant*") *as if it were* "*son*", *and* (Marc. iv. 22) *applies it to the Transfiguration.*

§ 6. *Evidence, apart from Isaiah, that the Messiah was once called "Chosen"*

[812] The Book of Enoch—of which the opening words are said to have been written about two hundred years before the preaching of John the Baptist—begins thus, "The words of the blessing of Enoch, wherewith he blessed *the chosen* and righteous[1]." In another passage written about a hundred years later (say 70 B.C.)[2] it speaks of a voice (§ 40) "blessing *the Chosen One*, and the chosen ones who cleave to the Lord of Spirits"; and "*the Chosen One*" is repeated frequently to mean the Messiah[3]. In the Bible, the title of "*Chosen*" is given to Jacob because he was *chosen* above Esau, and to the nation of Israel because it was *chosen* above other nations, and to the tribe of Levi because it was *chosen* to the priesthood, and to Aaron because he was *chosen* above the rest of Levi, against the opposition of Korah who was of the same tribe. In the contest between Korah and Aaron occur the words uttered by Moses (Numb. xvi. 7) "The man whom the Lord shall *choose*, he [shall be] holy[4]."

[813] In one of the latest books of the Bible, we have the old Hebrew view—that the Deliverer is always "*chosen*" —repeatedly illustrated in a single short passage, supposed to be uttered by David (1 Chr. xxviii. 4–6), "The God of Israel

[1] [812*a*] Enoch, ed. Charles pp. 25–6. Instead of "elect", I have everywhere substituted "*chosen*", so as to avoid the change from the noun "elect" to the verb "*choose*"—a change that often obscures in English the identity of words in a Hebrew or Greek original.

[2] *Ib.* p. 29.

[3] [812*b*] *Ib.* p. 112 n. mentions "the Chosen One" as occurring about 13 times, "the Messiah" as occurring only twice.

[4] [812*c*] *This is the first Biblical mention of God's "choosing"*, and it connects the "Chosen" with "*holiness*". Elsewhere, *Aaron—and he alone in O.T.—is called* (Ps. cvi. 16) "*the Holy One* of the Lord." Other passages of O.T. mentioning (in A.V.) "the holy one" should be translated differently (Lev. xxi. 7, 8 is not to the point).

chose me out of all the house of my father to be king over Israel for ever, for he hath *chosen* Judah to be prince; and in the house of Judah [he *chose*] the house of my father; and among the sons of my father he was *well-pleased* in me to make me king over all Israel; and of all my sons.....he hath *chosen* Solomon.....and he said unto me.....I have *chosen*[1] him to be my son, and I will be his father[2]."

[814] Similarly, commenting on the passage in Genesis (xlix. 17) that describes Jacob as "waiting for" the salvation of the Lord, the Targum of Onkelos—which, as a rule, adheres closely to the Hebrew and makes very few additions—thus describes the future Deliverer: "From the house of Dan *will be chosen* and will arise a man in whose days his people shall be delivered.....A *chosen* man will arise from the house of Dan....[3]"

§ 7. *Disuse of "Chosen" as a name for the Messiah*

[815] To the question, "Why did the Messiah cease to be called the Chosen?" the answer that at once suggests itself is, "for the same reasons as those for which (as was indicated above) the Messiah ceased to be called "the *Saint* (or, *Holy One*) of God." When all Christians came to be called—at least ideally as in St Paul's Epistles—"saints", a more distinctive term was needed for Him whom "the saints" worshipped. Similarly, when all were, at least in theory and

[1] [813 *a*] The LXX here renders "*choose*", alternately, ἐκλέγομαι and αἱρετίζω. The latter is comparatively rare, but Mt. (xii. 18) uses it in the verse in which he mistranslates Isaiah xlii. 1.

[2] [813 *b*] These words represent the son of David as also son of God. Ps. lxxxix. 27 represents David himself as the "firstborn" of God. Ps. ii. 7 "Thou art my son" is said by Justin Martyr (1035) to have been uttered through David speaking "in his person"—an obscure sentence. In any case, 1 Chr. xxviii. 6 affords another instance of the connection, in Hebrew literature, between divine "*choosing*" and divine *sonship*.

[3] The parallel Jer. I. (797 *d*) mentions "*chosen*" only once, Jer. II. not at all.

name, "the *chosen*" (or "elect") of God, the latter term seemed no longer suitable for Christ[1]. It is true that the Book of Enoch mentions the *Chosen One* and *the chosen ones* together: but that was a century and a half before the Messiah had come to be regarded as the Eternal Son of God incarnate for the redemption of man. All this is so obvious that it would not be worth recording except as an introduction to a passage in John where "*the Chosen* [*One*]" is a various reading (Jn i. 34) "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is (R.V.) *the Son* of God." Here the Codex Sinaiticus and the best Latin MSS. have either "*the Chosen* of God" or "*the Chosen Son* of God," and the former reading is now confirmed by the Syro-Sinaitic.

[816] What positive motive, we may well ask, could any one have for altering "*Son* of God" here—if that had been John's expression—into "*Chosen* of God"? Yet on the other hand, are we to believe that the best Greek MSS.—which, later on[2], faithfully give us Peter's exact words, "the Holy One of God," in spite of their unfamiliarity—have corrupted

---

[1] [815 *a*] The necessity felt for explaining the term "*Chosen*", when applied to Christ, comes out in an interesting passage where Epiphanius (like the Ebionite extract (580), which he has preserved) conflates two Voices from Heaven as follows (*Ancor.* 49, Vol. ii. 53) "Let them learn from the Father, who saith, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.' Again, as though to deal with their delay [to believe] (Πάλιν ὡς ἐπὶ μελλόντων), He saith, 'For thou art my beloved Son, whom I have *chosen*'..... *These foolish people suppose, that in saying 'I have chosen', He is called Son in respect of favour, and not in respect of birth.*" And he proceeds to explain "*chosen*", *as referring to the "choosing" of Mary, the Lord's mother!*

[815 *b*] Nothing in the context indicates whether Epiphanius is quoting the Voice at the Baptism, or that at the Transfiguration. His first Voice agrees with Matthew's version of the Voice at the Baptism; his second agrees with no canonical version of either Voice.

[2] [816 *a*] In Jn vi. 69, ℵBC*DL have "the Holy One of God" (A and T are defective). In Jn i. 34, ℵ is the only one of the leading MSS. that has "the Chosen" (D is defective).

the Baptist's words here simply because they are unfamiliar and not sufficiently strong? The question is not to be hastily decided; but it must be kept before us when we have to deal with the Johannine narrative, and with the reasons why John, though giving at some length the Baptist's testimony to Jesus in the place where he was baptizing, yet mentions no Voice from Heaven.

CHAPTER II

"HEAR YE HIM"

§ 1. *The phrase introduces a "Messenger" in Exodus and a "Prophet" in Deuteronomy*

[**817**] HAVING dealt with that portion of the two Synoptic Voices from Heaven which is common to both of them, we proceed to the words peculiar to the Voice at the Transfiguration, "*Hear ye him*". Since the first portion appears to have been derived from a text of Scripture, it is reasonable to start with a working hypothesis that the second portion had a similar origin. If so, there are only two passages that can claim to be our archetype. The first is in Exodus (xxiii. 20), where God promises to send a Messenger (or, Angel[1]) for the guidance of Israel, and gives them the warning "*Hearken thou unto his voice*.....for my Name is in him." The second, in Deuteronomy (xviii. 15), introduces Moses saying that the Lord will raise up for Israel a Prophet like himself, and adding "*Unto him ye shall hearken.*" So far, then, a Bath Kol, repeating the words "*Hearken ye unto him*" over a great

[1] [**817** *a*] The Hebrew is the same for "Messenger" and for "Angel", and so is the Greek. The meaning has to be determined by the context. Throughout this chapter, "Messenger" may be briefly used for "Messenger or Angel".

teacher in the first century, would seem likely to suggest to Jews either "*Hearken unto him as the 'Messenger'* who has in him the sacred Name," or else, "*Hearken unto him as the 'Prophet'* like unto Moses."

[818] But might not the Messenger in Exodus be identical with the Prophet in Deuteronomy? In Malachi, at all events, one "Messenger" is commonly identified with Elijah the Prophet. And there is a great similarity between Exodus—especially if we read "*my* messenger" with the LXX—and Malachi (iii. 1) "Behold I send *my messenger*, and he shall prepare the way before me." Who is the "*Messenger*" here? Malachi's next words might be expected to answer this, "And the Lord (*Adon*), whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple *and the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in*, behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts." But unfortunately they are ambiguous. Instead of "and" ("*and* the Messenger"), R. V. has, in the margin, "*even*". Thus we are left in doubt whether "*the Messenger* of the Covenant" is "the Lord", or a servant of the Lord sent to prepare the way before Him, and in the latter case, whether he is, or is not, identical with the person previously described as simply "*Messenger*". Moreover, a little later on, Malachi says (iv. 5) "Behold, I will send you *Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come*." This suggests that the "*Messenger*" is "Elijah", descending from the heaven to which he ascended, and combining the two titles "*Messenger*" and "*Prophet*". But, on the other hand, according to the marginal reading above-mentioned ("the Lord...*even* the Messenger"), we may suppose that the Lord, "*the Messenger*" *of God*, is distinct from Elijah. All this is extremely confusing, and it ought not to be surprising if we find signs of confusion both in Jewish and in Christian writers when they quote or discuss these three passages from Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Malachi.

§ 2. *Jewish traditions concerning the "Messenger" and the "Prophet"*

(i) The Messenger

[**819**] Concerning the prediction in Exodus about the Messenger the Jerusalem Talmud is silent, and so is a large part of the Babylonian[1]. Evidence, however, that there were early variations of interpretation may be derived from the following facts.

[**820**] The Hebrew says (Exod. xxiii. 20–21) "Behold, I send *a* Messenger before thy face,.....*my name is in him*," lit. "*in the midst of him*," a rare or unique expression perhaps intended to denote a higher grade of divine inspiration than would be implied by "my name is *on* him."

[**821**] The LXX has "I send *my* messenger before thy face.....my name is *on* him," substituting "*on*", the regular preposition in such a phrase, for "in the midst of".

[**822**] Philo quotes the passage thrice (always, of course, from the LXX). In one place he takes the Messenger as a Mediator between man and God, the divine *Logos*, needful for human nature until it is perfect (i. 463), "For, until one has been perfected, one needs as guide the divine *Logos*. For there is an oracle [that speaks] as follows (Exod. xxiii. 20–1) 'Behold, I send .....'." Elsewhere he gives to the Messenger the lower title of "Voice of God" and connects it with "prophet" thus (*Fragm.* Mang. vol. vi. p. 243 comm. on Exod. xxiii. 20), "'*Voice of God*' we must suppose to be the meaning of the 'Messenger' just mentioned. For of Him who is [there] speaking the *prophet* is a Messenger, [namely], of [the] Lord[2]." In a third passage he comments

[1] [**819** *a*] Exod. xxiii. 20–21 is not mentioned in the Indices of Levy, Schwab, or the first three vols. of Goldschmidt.

[2] [**822** *a*] The meaning of this is not apparent without a comparison of the Hebrew with the LXX, which Philo follows. The former says,

on "name" (LXX "my name is on him"), saying that it is "the sovereign (principalius) name whereby heaven and earth and the whole Universe are controlled," and speaks of the Messenger as "the *Word*, called *Angel*, necessarily constituted *Interpreter and Mediator*" owing to the inability of man to receive God's gifts except indirectly[1].

[**823**] Onkelos repeats the LXX error of inserting "*my*" before Messenger[2]. As to "my name is *in the midst of* him," though he does not follow the LXX in substituting "*on*", he departs still further from the Hebrew (and the Jerusalem Targum deviates similarly): "*In my name are his words*"—a phrase that might be used of any prophet or leader inspired by God.

[**824**] The general silence of Jewish tradition may be explained, in part at least, by an interesting discussion (in the Babylonian Talmud) between a heretic (*i.e.* Christian)

"Behold, I send a messenger...", and then, "But if thou shalt indeed hearken unto *his* voice and do all that *I* speak." This means (as Jer. Targ.) "do all that *I* speak *through him*." There is therefore in the change of pronouns ("*his* voice...*I* speak") only a superficial difficulty. But it seems to have puzzled the LXX, who change "his" into "my". This alteration having been adopted by Philo (as we know from his fuller quotation in *Quaest. in Exod.* Lib. ii. § 16) it becomes necessary for him to explain, in the connection thus created by the LXX ("My Messenger ...*my* voice"), that by "*my* voice", *i.e.* the Voice of God, is indicated (*μηνύεσθαι*) the "Messenger" just mentioned.

[1] [**822** *b*] *Quaest. in Exod.* ii. § 13 (Mang. *P. A.* 476–8) "Ex necessitate tamquam *arbiter ac mediator* constitutum est *verbum* quod vocatur *angelus*." Subsequently he says that the Messenger, in dealing with the backslider, "Conviciatur et accusat atque *rugiens minis* pudefacit."

A fourth quotation (i. 308) deviates from the LXX and is rightly bracketed by Mangey as an interpolation. It follows a (genuine) mention of God's Right Word, the First-born Son.

[2] [**823** *a*] Jer. Targ. does not. "*My*" might arise from the insertion of a final *yod*, or from the fact that the Being spoken of is called "*my* Messenger" in Exod. xxiii. 23. In xxiii. 22, "If ye will hear *his* voice and do whatsoever I speak," LXX substitutes "*my* voice"; Jer. Targ. makes the meaning clear thus: "hear *his* voice and do whatsoever I speak *by him*" (so that "*his* voice" is, in fact, "*my* voice") (see above **822**).

and a Rabbi, where the latter says that "the angel" is "the Metatron whose name is as the name of his Master, because it is written (Exod. xxiii. 21) My name is in him." Upon this the Christian insists that we ought to pray to this Being, and presses the Rabbi hard on the ground of the words "Be not rebellious against him," and, "He will not forgive your transgressions." These arguments the Rabbi does not meet. He breaks off the controversy by saying that he and his people will have nothing to do with any Mediator, because it is written (Exod. xxxiii. 15) "If *thy face* go not up with us," i.e. *thine own Person*[1].

(ii) The Prophet

[**825**] The prediction in Deuteronomy about the "prophet like unto me (*i.e.* unto Moses)" seems not to be quoted at all in the Jerusalem Talmud, and not in the early sections of the Babylonian. Schöttgen says he has nowhere found it applied to the Messiah in Jewish literature[2], but that the Jews commented upon its relation to the later utterance in Deuteronomy (xxxiv. 10) "And there hath *not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses*," as though one never *would* arise. This view is certainly taken in a passage of the Babylonian Talmud where a Bath Kol, chiding the Preacher for desiring equality with Moses, quotes this verse against

[1] [**824** *a*] Sanh. 38 *b*. The Hebrew in Schöttgen (ii. 377, 656) differs somewhat from that in Goldschmidt; and their rendering of what is identical also differs. With reference to Exod. xxiii. 21 "Thou shalt not *be rebellious* (תמר) against him" it occurs thus in Goldschmidt: "Thou shalt not *be rebellious* (תמר) against him (בו), thou shalt not *exchange me* (תמירני) with him" ("verwechsle mich nicht mit ihm"). Are we to suppose that the Rabbi, playing on the similarity of the words המר (hif.) "rebel" and המיר (hif.) "exchange"—says, in effect, "Read, not תמר, but תמיר, and say "Thou shalt not take the Angel in exchange for God"?

[2] Schöttg. i. 419. It is absent from the Indices of Schwab, of the three volumes of Goldschmidt, and of Levy.

him[1]. From this it would appear that the Jews took the prediction to mean merely that God would raise up in Israel from time to time a prophet inspired, as Moses was, with the Holy Spirit, but *not inspired in the same degree nor to be compared with him for greatness.* This perhaps is the meaning of the paraphrase in the Jerusalem Targum "a Right Prophet (*or*, a Prophet of Righteousness).....a Prophet from among you, like unto me, *with the Holy Spirit*[2]." There is in this Targum certainly nothing to imply that the Targumist contemplates a new Lawgiver, or the introducer of a new epoch[3].

(iii) The Messenger and the Prophet

[826] As to the "Messenger" in Malachi, there is no quotation of the passage in the Jerusalem Talmud, the earlier portion of the Babylonian, or Levy. Kimchi reads "the Lord whom ye seek, *even* the Messenger of the Covenant," and says, "He is *King Messiah* and *also* the Angel of the Covenant"; but other Jews, according to Kimchi's own statement, took the Messenger of the Covenant to be Elijah[4].

[1] Ros. Hasanah 22 *a*.

[2] See below **843** foll.

[3] [**825** *a*] Philo appears nowhere to quote the Deuteronomic prediction about "the prophet like unto Moses." He does, on the other hand, quote (i. 511) passages that emphasize the inferiority of the later prophets to Moses, *e.g.* Numbers (xii. 6–8) (LXX) "If there be among you a prophet of the Lord, I will make myself known unto him in a vision...but to Moses by the sense of sight (ἐν εἴδει) and not through dark sayings." Then he quotes the saying (Deut. xxxiv. 10 (LXX)) "There arose not any more a prophet like Moses whom the Lord knew face to face." If he had taken the Deuteronomic "Prophet like Moses" either as a type of the Messiah, or as parallel to "the Messenger (or Angel)" in Exodus, he could hardly have failed to quote the expression at least once in his voluminous works. His silence, and his somewhat low general estimate of prophecy, and the stress laid by him on the inferiority of all prophets to Moses, all combine to shew that he took the Jewish view of the phrase as meaning "a succession of prophets inspired by the Holy Spirit as Moses was."

[4] [**826** *a*] See Schöttgen (ii. 225), who adds that (*ib.* 224) Debarim rabba sect. 4 fol. 256. 2 (compiled (Schür. I. i. 148) about A.D. 900)

[827] Our investigations lead to this conclusion, that at a very early period there was difference of opinion among the Jews as to the Messenger mentioned in Exodus, and again in Malachi, and a tendency to corrupt the former passage, apparent in the LXX, Onkelos, and the Jerusalem Targum. To some very slight extent this tendency appears even in the Babylonian Talmud, which quotes it in a manner indicating that the passage afforded matter of controversy between Jews and Christians. Its frequent quotation by Philo should be borne in mind as a contrast with the silence of the Jerusalem Talmud, and as an indication that in the first century the passage was much more discussed than in later times.

[828] Nothing can be concluded with certainty about the Jewish use of the Deuteronomic prediction concerning the "prophet like unto Moses," but there is a strong probability that, from Philo onwards, the Jews regarded it as merely promising a succession of prophetic teachers each of whom was to be inspired with some portion of the Spirit that rested upon Moses. This, however, *would not exclude the belief that the Prophet that was to revive the succession would be also the Messenger promised in Exodus*: and accordingly Malachi, if he does not actually assert, was at all events believed by most Jews to imply, that the "Prophet" Elijah was also the "Messenger" of the Covenant.

[829] Under the head of Jewish tradition we must reckon a passage in John implying that the Sanhedrin distinguished

connects Malachi's Messenger with Isaiah's prediction (xl. 4) "Every valley shall be exalted &c."—a connection that is of interest inasmuch as Mark (and Mark alone) combines Malachi (iii. 1) and Isaiah (xl. 3) under the heading of "Isaiah", see below (**830** *a*, **833** *a*) in describing the advent of John the Baptist.

Elsewhere Schöttgen says (ii. 15) that, as far as he knows, "solus ex recentioribus Kimchius Messiam explicuit [angelum foederis]"; but he adds from Sohar a saying that "the Angel of the Covenant" always means God.

between the Messiah, Elijah, and "the prophet", as three personalities any one of which would have conferred the right to baptize: (Jn i. 25) "Why baptizest thou then, if thou art neither *the Christ*, nor *Elijah*, nor *the prophet*?" These words harmonize with the Synoptic narrative, which contrasts "Some say that thou art *Elijah*," and "Some say that thou art *one of the ancient prophets*," with "Thou art *the Christ*"—the former being the talk of the multitude, the latter the Confession of Peter. The two traditions taken together, the Synoptic and the Johannine, indicate a close connection, in Jewish thought, between the Messiah who was to be the ultimate Deliverer, Elijah the Messenger who was to prepare the way for the Messiah, and the Prophet like Moses who, after four centuries, was to revive the succession of the Holy Spirit and to precede Elijah. Concerning the last two, any Jew would believe that God, introducing either of them to Israel, *uttered the words "Hear ye him" in heaven*, whether they were, or were not, made audible to men in a Bath Kol on earth. Concerning the Messiah, there was no such precedent; but the utterance might seem to some appropriate as meaning "*Hear ye him, not as the Prophet like unto Moses, nor as the Messenger Elijah, but as my Anointed, Chosen by me to be my First-born.*"

§ 3. *Christian canonical traditions concerning the "Messenger"*

[830] The Synoptists take their mention of the Messenger not from Exodus but from Malachi. But they all misquote the prophecy ("*thy* face" for "*my* face"). Two of them attribute the quotation to Jesus, whereas Mark quotes it in his own person. Mark wrongly attributes it to Isaiah instead of Malachi.

Malachi has (iii. 1) "Behold, I send my messenger and he *shall prepare*" [lit. "shall *face*" = "shall clear from before

my face," *i.e.* shall free from obstacles] "a way before my face."

The LXX has mistaken "shall *face*" as though it meant "shall *turn the face towards*," but is otherwise correct:

"Behold I send forth my messenger and he shall *look-to* a way before my face."

The Synoptists have:—

Mk i. 1–3

"'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written *in Isaiah* the prophet, 'Behold I send my messenger before *thy* face who shall prepare *thy* way[1].' 'The voice of one crying...'."

Mt. xi. 9–10, Lk. vii. 26–7

"...A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. This is he concerning whom it is written, 'Behold I send my messenger before *thy* face who shall prepare *thy* way *before thee*.'"

[831] How came Malachi's words to be so seriously misquoted both in the Synoptic Tradition by Mark, and in the Double Tradition by Matthew and Luke? Perhaps the best conjecture is that, as often in the Talmuds, the quotation in the Original was not set down in full but simply contained the initial words, *not from Malachi but from Exodus*, "Behold I send my[2] messenger before *thy* face." This in itself might lead to confusion with the similar prophecy in Malachi "Behold I send my messenger before *my* face." We know, too, that these words are associated with early error in Mark (who assigns them to "Isaiah") and also in Clement of Rome, who (as we shall find) seriously alters the context and perhaps quotes from some apocryphal document like *Eldad and*

[1] [830 *a*] The words of Isaiah do not begin till "The voice", but Mk attributes also "Behold.....way" to him, though it belongs to Malachi.

In the Synoptic parallels to Mk i. 3, Matthew (iii. 3) and Luke (iii. 4) mention "Isaiah", when quoting "The voice": comp. Jn i. 23 "*I* [am] 'the voice of one crying...the Lord' (as said the prophet Isaiah)."

[2] "My", *i.e.* the reading (821, 823) of Onkelos and the LXX.

Medad[1]. It is not difficult to conceive that Evangelists, deciding that Malachi, not Exodus, was the true source, might complete the prediction in the language of the former, and yet inadvertently retain "*thy* face" with the latter[2].

[**832**] Justin and Tertullian both explain the Exodus prediction about the Messenger, "*my name is on him*," as being uttered by the Lord, or the Son of God, *hereafter to be incarnate as Jesus of Nazareth, concerning Joshua, or Jesus, the son of Nun, as bearing His future name.* This implies that God spoke "in the person, or face (προσώπῳ), of Jesus[3]." This very curious tradition—which does not appear to have been derived from Jewish sources, and which certainly did not commend itself to Christians, if we may draw this inference from the fact that it is not repeated by a single Ante-Nicene Father[4]—might possibly arise from an early Greek gloss on the Malachi quotation in the earliest Gospel, that of Mark. Mark alone quotes the passage in his own person. The

[1] See below (**837**).

[2] [**831** *a*] Less probably the error may have sprung from Greek corruption. Suppose Jesus to have quoted correctly from Malachi "Behold I send my messenger before *my* face." Writers of gospels—thinking that "*my* face" might be misunderstood as "*Christ's* face"—might write "God's" over "*my*". This might easily be corrupted into "thy", because ΜΟΥ, with $\overline{\text{ΘΥ}}$ over it, might easily be taken as intended to be corrected into ϹΟΥ. Comp. (though the explanation is different) Mt. xxiii. 34 "I send" = Lk. xi. 49 "The Wisdom of God said, I send."

[3] [**832** *a*] In one of these explanations, Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* § 9) (but not Justin) goes on to explain the Malachi prediction as uttered "*in the person of* (*ex persona*) the Father."

[4] [**832** *b*] For Jewish tradition, see **819** foll. Otto (Just. Mart. *Tryph.* § 75), besides referring to other passages of Justin and to Tertull. *Marc.* iii. 16, *Adv. Jud.* § 9 &c., adds Lactant. *Inst. Div.* iv. 17 and Clem. Alex. 134. But the last two do not quote or refer to Exodus ("my name is in him"). Indeed Clem. Alex. quotes Deuteronomy (xviii. 15) where the essential words do not occur.

[**832** *c*] Perhaps most Christian Fathers felt a difficulty in very closely connecting Christ, even typically, with a passage containing the words (Exod. xxiii. 21) "He will *not* forgive your transgressions."

glosser might add, "These words are also uttered in the person of Jesus." By this, he might mean that they were repeated by Jesus when describing John the Baptist in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke: but Justin *might take the gloss to refer to the original O. T. passage as being "uttered in the person of Jesus" by God the Son concerning His namesake Jesus the son of Nun*[1]. Whatever may be its origin, it points to a very early Christian belief that the words in Exodus "I send my messenger before thy face" referred typically to Jesus as "Messenger".

[**833**] As for Mark's erroneous use of the name "Isaiah", discussion would be out of place here[2]; but it must be noted as one more indication of the mass of early errors that had clustered round the confusing traditions about the Messenger. It will be well to recapitulate here the possibilities of Christian interpretation.

[**834**] In Exodus, "Messenger before thy face" might be Jesus typified by Joshua, going before the face of Israel, and regarded as "the Messenger, or Angel, of the Covenant."

It might also be taken, apart from its context, as the Baptist going before the face of Jesus.

In Malachi, "My messenger..... shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple *and* (or, *even*) the messenger of the Covenant..." may mean three persons, if we read "and" and if the first "messenger" is distinct, both from the Lord and from the

[1] [**832** *d*] Another explanation might be based on the word "face" or "person". In answer to the question "Whose face?" a marginal note might be added "The face of Jesus is meant." As the Gk λέγεται means "is *said*", as well as "is *meant*", this might easily be corrupted into "In the person of Jesus *it is said*."

[2] [**833** *a*] The most obvious suggestion is that the Malachi quotation was first added in the margin as akin to the Isaiah quotation, and was then inadvertently inserted in the text immediately after "Isaiah". Schöttgen (ii. 224) says that Debarim rabb. (iv. 256 *b*) joins Mal. iii. 1 and iii. 23 (R.V. iv. 5) and Is. xl. 4, as referring to the same person.

second "messenger". If we read "even", only two persons at most are intended.

If there are three persons, they might be supposed to be (1) John the Baptist, (2) the Lord Jesus, (3) Elijah[1] (at the Second Coming of Christ). If there are two, they might be the Lord Jesus and John the Baptist, or the Lord and Elijah: or some might say that the Baptist *was* Elijah reincarnate, others, that the Baptist was "in the spirit and power of Elijah."

[835] The main reason for dwelling on these speculative distinctions is that they help us to understand John's attitude when he briefly sweeps them all away in the Fourth Gospel, avoiding the Malachi quotation altogether, and describing the Baptist simply as "a man sent from God," who expressly disclaimed the titles of "Elijah" and of "the prophet", as well as that of "Christ".

§ 4. *Christian non-canonical traditions concerning the "Messenger"*

[836] An early non-canonical quotation of the Exodus prediction is found in the Acta Pilati (A). The context describes a conversation among the Jews after Christ's death upon hearing rumours of His Resurrection. They speak of Elijah, Enoch, and Moses—three precedents of ascension or mysterious burial—and then a Rabbi quotes Exodus (xxiii. 20) thus, "Behold I send my Messenger before thy face who shall go before thee to keep thee in every good way because *my name is called in it* (fem.) [i.e. *in the way*]." The reader will observe that the Rabbi follows Onkelos and the LXX in reading "*my* Messenger", and that, like Onkelos, he deviates—

[1] "Elijah" is expressly mentioned a little later (Mal. iv. 5) "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come."

though with a different deviation—from the Hebrew phrase "My name is *in* him[1]."

The view of Justin and Tertullian, that "my name" (in "*my name* is in him") means the name of Jesus, and that the passage refers to Jesus typified by Joshua, has been discussed incidentally above (**832**).

[**837**] There remains a quotation that should have come, on chronological grounds, immediately after the Synoptists, since it occurs in the Epistle written about A.D. 90 by Clement of Rome to the Corinthians; but it is so transmuted that it may almost be called a separate tradition. Clement is warning his readers to be patient under tribulation while waiting for the Day of the Lord, (§ 23) "Far be from us this Scripture where He saith: *Wretched are the doubleminded.*[2].....Of a truth, quickly and suddenly shall His will be accomplished, the Scripture also bearing witness to it, saying: *He shall come quickly and shall not tarry; and the Lord shall come suddenly into His temple, even*[3] *the Holy One whom ye expect.*" Lightfoot shews that the "Scripture" first mentioned above "must have been taken from some spurious prophetic book formed on the model of the Canonical prophecies. I would conjecture," he says, "that it was *Eldad and Medad*, which was certainly

[1] Acta P. (A) xvi. 3. The context suggests that the writer has in view Jn xiv. 2 "I go to prepare a place for you," and that he regards Jesus as "going before" His disciples across the river of death.

[2] [**837** *a*] Here follows a long quotation ending with an illustration from the growth of the vine. Lightf. *ad loc.* "See Herm. *Vis.* ii. 3 ἐγγὺς Κύριος τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδὰδ τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ, a passage alleged by Hermas for the same purpose as our quotation to refute one who is sceptical about the approaching afflictions of the last times." It is interesting to note that one MS. alters the uncanonical names Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάδ, into ἐλάλη κατὰ μωσῆ δαβίδ.

[**837** *b*] The article ἐν τῷ Ἐλδάδ illustrates Mk i. 2 ἐν τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ. The name Ἡσαίας occurs about 20 times in N.T. but never preceded by the article except here (**839** *a*).

[3] "Even", so Lightfoot renders καί (see **818**).

known in the early Roman Church." As to the second "Scripture" he regards it as a combination of Isaiah (xiii. 22 "shall come quickly and shall not tarry") and Malachi (iii. 1). But it is possible that Clement may be quoting the "Scripture" just mentioned, which may have combined extracts from the two prophets, and this might explain the substitution (in the Malachi extract) of "*Holy One*" for "*Messenger of the Covenant*."

[838] Concerning this substitution Lightfoot says that it "may have been intentional, but is much more probably an inadvertence of Clement, who quotes from memory largely but loosely and *is influenced by the interpretation which he has in view*." The words I have italicized appear to mean that Clement so habitually alters his quotations to suit his own views of them, and so often "largely but loosely", that he perhaps seldom knows whether he alters or not, and therefore can never be accused of making an "intentional" alteration. In any case, the "interpretation" that Clement (or the author of *Eldad and Medad*) had here "in view", was probably suggested by the feeling that the Lord *ought not to be called Messenger or Angel, nor even "Angel of the Covenant"*. The Epistle to the Hebrews—which Clement not only quotes but "imitates"[1]—devotes a large part of its opening chapter to shew that Christ is *not* one of the "angels", but superior to them; and although Justin Martyr[2] maintains that the name may be given to our Lord, few Christian writers appear to have agreed with him. Hence Clement—if it is Clement—might wish to paraphrase "angel". If he did, there was open to him the synonym "Holy One", which in O. T. occasionally[3], and in the Book of Enoch very frequently, means "angel".

[1] "Imitates", so Lightfoot, in his Index, under the heading "Hebrews, Epistle to", where he gives many instances of imitation.

[2] *Tryph.* § 58–61.

[3] [838 *a*] "*Holy ones*" is said (Buhl) to be used for "*angels*" in

[839] Lightfoot continues, "This portion of Malachi's prophecy is quoted much less frequently in early Christian writers than we should have expected. On the other hand, the first part of the same verse *ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου* is quoted Matth. xi. 10, Mark i. 2, Luke vii. 27, and not seldom by the early fathers, by whom, following the Evangelists, it is explained of John the Baptist." From one point of view we might certainly have expected frequent quotations of the words in question, since they are peculiarly appropriate to describe Jesus "coming to his temple" to purify it; and they might also well be used, as Clement uses them, to describe the Second Coming. But the feeling against calling Christ a Messenger, or "Angel", is sufficient to explain why Christian theologians dropped this part of the prophecy. True, Clement quotes it. *But that is because he is able—whether inadvertently or unscrupulously—to alter "angel" into "Holy One".* In more careful or scrupulous ages, this could not be done. Hence the latter part fell into such utter disuse (as a quotation) that the English Indices of the Ante-Nicene Fathers do not give a single instance of it except Clement's corrupt blending of Isaiah and Malachi—which may possibly come, not from Clement, but from the author of some apocryphal work like *Eldad and Medad*[1].

Deut. xxxiii. 3 and in Zech. xiv. 5. The latter is printed by W.H. as quoted from Zech. in Mt. xxv. 31; but Mt. *has "angels" instead of "holy ones".* Job v. 1 (R.V.) "*holy ones*", (A.V.) "*saints*",=LXX "*holy angels*". For the usage in Enoch, see Charles's note on i. 9. Jude 14 ("tens of thousands of *holy ones*") is printed by W.H. as quoted from Deut. xxxiii. 2 ((lit.) "ten thousands of *holiness*," R.V. "*holy ones*") and Zech. xiv. 5: but the editors must merely mean that similar expressions are found in Deut. and Zech., not that Jude is quoting from them. For *Jude expressly tells us that he is quoting "Enoch".*

[1] [839 *a*] Comp. (*a*) Heb. x. 37, which is a blend of Is. xxvi. 20 and Hab. ii. 3, (*b*) Jude 14, a blend of Deut. xxxiii. 2 and Zech. xiv. 5, (*c*) the present passage, a blend of Is. xiii. 22 and Mal. iii. 1. All three passages refer to the Second Coming. Jude (14) says that he is quoting from "Enoch". Again, (*d*) in Mk i. 2–3, another blend of Malachi and

[840] Our conclusion is that, in the first century and a part of the second, many more Christians than in later times were disposed to recognize in Christ the Messenger, or Angel, of the New Covenant; and the three or four survivals of this usage are specimens of a much larger number once existing in a literature that is now submerged.

§ 5. *Christian traditions concerning the "Prophet"*

[841] Though the Gospels frequently connect the title of "prophet" with Jesus it is almost always in the mouths of the multitude, or those who are not disciples, *e.g.* the Samaritan woman. The general rule is illustrated by an exception, where the two disciples that have lost faith in Jesus after His death call Him "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God," and are rebuked by Him as "foolish and slow of heart[1]." Since even the Lord's forerunner, John the Baptist, is called "more than a prophet," it would be strange if the Lord Himself received that appellation from His own followers. It is true that, in answer to the question, "Whom say men that I am?" they report that *others* call Him "prophet", but the narrative implies that *they* do not[2].

[842] But, when we turn from the Gospels to the Acts, we find in a speech of Peter[3] a passage where the Deuteronomic prediction about the Prophet is connected with Jesus

Isaiah is attributed to "Isaiah", and "Isaiah" has before it the unique (837 *b*) article, found, in Hermas, before "Eldad". Possibly some corruption is latent under "the Isaiah".

[1] Lk. xxiv. 19, 25.

[2] Mk viii. 28, Mt. xvi. 14, Lk. ix. 19.

[3] One sentence of the prediction is also quoted in the speech of Stephen, (Acts vii. 37) "This is that Moses who said, A prophet shall God raise...like unto me." (A few MSS. add, "Him shall ye hear.") Stephen's speech proceeds "This is he that was in the congregation in the wilderness...," without any further reference to the Prophet. It is impossible to base on this any secure inference as to a Messianic application.

in such a way as to give the impression that the speaker regards the words "a prophet like unto me" as pointing definitely to Christ and to no other. As this view has been adopted by a multitude of Christian theologians—though not by Wetstein—it is important to examine the grounds for it.

[843] The Jewish view—briefly mentioned above (**825**)—is that the prediction indicates *a succession of prophets*. This agrees well with the preceding words, which warn Israel against "augury" and "divination", *i.e.* against omens from birds and beasts, the bones of the dead, demoniacally inspired utterances, &c. Instead of these, Israel is to receive from time to time God's special guidance through *inspired human nature*, a prophet from one of their own countrymen ("from the midst of thee, of thy brethren"). The words "*like unto me*" appear to mean "not like the soothsayers, seers, and prophets, of the Greeks, Phrygians, or Babylonians; not acting under the influence of mephitic vapours, or trance, or demoniacal possession, but like Moses, the archetype, filled with the Spirit of Righteousness." This is what the Jerusalem Targum may briefly indicate when it inserts the words "a Right Prophet, or, Prophet of Righteousness," and "with the Holy Spirit." "Like unto me", according to this view, means that each prophet, from time to time, will resemble the national type; and there is no intention to indicate a special prophet, or to suggest that, in the line of successors, most will be *unlike* Moses, and one alone will be "*like*" him.

[844] Further, the Deuteronomic writer lays great stress upon the responsibility of the prophet to Jehovah, whose words he is to speak, and upon the penalty to be exacted from the disobedient prophet; which is to be more severe, or at least more prompt, than the punishment of the people for disobeying the prophecy. If the prophet is disobeyed by his countrymen, the Lord "will require it" of them; but as for the prophet that speaks what God has not commanded,

or speaks in the name of other gods, he "*shall die*". In the former case the penalty is deferred and left to God; in the latter, it is to be inflicted at once by man (comp. Deut. xiii. 5). How different is this from the tone of the passage as quoted below in the Acts, where *no penalty at all is mentioned for the prophet; but the penalty of refusing to hearken to the prophet is to be "utterly destroyed from among the people"!* And it is just this point—*this transposition of the prophet's penalty to the people—that the great mass of Ante-Nicene Fathers have fastened on, in order to enhance the authority of Christ by intimidating the disobedient!*

[845] The misquotation cannot be proved to have influenced Christian theology till the date of the composition of the Acts; but probably some influence of this kind was at work during the period when the Gospels were being composed. The two passages are therefore given at full length below. After the quotation in the Acts a few words of Peter's comment are added, because they contain words that may denote an obscure recognition of *the Jewish and correct interpretation*, viz. that "*a prophet* (*from time to time*)," and not "a (single) prophet", is contemplated:—

Deut. xviii. 15–20

(15) "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; (16) according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice

Acts iii. 22–3, 24–5

[1] (22) "Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me, (marg. "as [*he raised up*] me"); to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. (23) And it shall be, that every soul which shall not

[1] The preceding words mention the sufferings of Christ as (iii. 18) "foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets" and (iii. 21) "the times of restoration of all things whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began."

of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. (17) And the Lord said unto me, They have well said that which they have spoken. (18) I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. (19) And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. (20) But the prophet that shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die."

hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people.

(24) "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days. (25) Ye are the sons of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with your fathers, saying unto Abraham..."[1]

[**846**] Passing to the use of the extract (whether as in Deuteronomy or as in Acts) in the Christian Church, we do not find it in Justin[2], nor (except incidentally (Iren. iii. 12. 3) in a number of long extracts from Peter's speeches) in Irenaeus. Clement of Alexandria, who seems to be the first to quote it, says that Moses utters the words prophetically ("A prophet ..... of your brethren"), "darkly mentioning

[1] [**845** *a*] Notice the words "*all the prophets from Samuel*," and, "ye are *the sons of the prophets*." These, with the phrases indicated in the preceding note, suggest that the documents on which Luke based his version of the speech may have taken *the Jewish view*. Peter may have called on the people to accept Jesus as the Restorer, not because He alone was "a prophet like Moses," but because *the unanimous testimony of the prophets that were "like Moses" pointed to Him.*

[2] [**846** *a*] Justin would probably be unwilling to call Christ "prophet". At all events, when he gives (*Tryph.* 126) about sixteen names of Christ, "prophet" is not one of them.

Jesus the son of Nun," to prepare the way for Jesus the Son of God[1]: "……he (Moses) adds, '*Him shall ye hear*,' and, as for '*the man that will not hear that Prophet*,' him he (Moses) threatens." The vague term, "threatens", is probably a condensation of Peter's phrase (not in O. T.), "that soul shall be utterly destroyed from among the people." The latter is given in full by Tertullian, indicating that *he is not really quoting from O. T. but from the Acts*[2].

[847] This shews that the English Indices to the Fathers are misleading as to this particular passage. They lead the reader to suppose that the Deuteronomic text is quoted some dozen times by Ante-Nicene writers. *But, in reality, the quotations are from the Acts*, as is shewn by the tell-tale words about "cutting off" (or "utterly destroying") *the man that disobeys the Prophet*[3]. As the quoters do not include

[1] [846 *b*] Clem. Alex. (134). Contrast, with this, the words of Bishop Archelaus (*Disputation with Manes*, § 43), "Now it is plain that this *cannot be understood to have been said of Jesus the son of Nun.*"

[2] [846 *c*] Tertull. *Marc.* iv. 22 "Unto him shall ye hearken *as unto me.* Everyone that will not hearken unto him, *that soul shall be cut off from amongst his people.*" Epiphanius (Vol. I. p. 464 D, *Haer.* liv. 3) says that Theodotus argued that the words "*like me* (*Moses*)" implied that Christ was a *man.* Tertullian's rendering "as unto me" gets rid of the argument of Theodotus. Novatian (*Trinity* § 9) also has "listen to him *as if to me.*"

[3] [847 *a*] This applies to Origen *Comm. Joann.* lib. vi. 4 and 8; Methodius (*Simeon and Anna* § 11); Epiphanius (Vol. I. p. 693 A, *Haer.* lxvi. 72); Recognitions of Clement i. 37; Apostolical Constitutions v. 20.

Cyprian *Test. agst. Jews* i. 18, and Lactantius *Div. Inst.* iv. 17 quote correctly from Deuteronomy. Novatian and Archelaus quote too briefly to indicate their source.

The Clementine Homilies do not quote the passage from the Acts, but are influenced by it: (iii. 53) "He said, I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied saying, A Prophet shall the Lord our God raise unto you of your brethren, like unto me: him hear in all things; and *whosoever will not hear that Prophet shall die.*"

[847 *b*] Origen against Celsus (i. 36, iv. 95) quotes "A prophet... brethren" to contrast augury and soothsaying (843) with the revelation

the context in the Acts referring to the continuity of prophecy, they retain scarcely a vestige of the meaning of the Deuteronomic original.

§ 6. "*Moses*" *and* "*Elijah*"

[848] We have found two distinct streams of post-evangelic Christian tradition indicating that "Hear ye him" might be taken by some to mean, "Hear ye Jesus of Nazareth as *the prophet like unto Moses*," by others to mean, "Hear him as *the Messenger*," that is (1) "Hear ye him *as Moses*," (2) "Hear ye him *as Elijah*." The two views might be harmonized as follows, "Hear ye him, *not as Moses alone, and not as Elijah alone, but as the Chosen of God, the Messiah, in whom the Law and the Prophets, Moses and Elijah, are summed up and included*."

[849] Whether there is any detailed and textual basis for supposing that this last view was actually adopted will have to be considered later on. Meantime it may be pointed out that the Synoptists themselves mention, shortly before the Transfiguration, conflicting opinions about Jesus, some asserting that He was Elijah, others that He was one of the ancient prophets. The former might be expressed in the words "He appeared to some Elijah." The latter—if it referred to the "prophet like Moses"—might be expressed as "He appeared to some the ancient prophet," or even, "He appeared to some Moses." The two together, when combined with the fact that God revealed to Peter, and to the disciples through Peter, that Jesus was the Christ, might originate a tradition of this kind: "*To some He appeared Moses and*

through (iv. 95) "the most pure and holy of human souls, whom He inspires and endows with prophetic power." He appears to be the only Ante-Nicene writer that retains a trace of the Deuteronomic meaning.

The extracts in this note are from Clark's Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Elijah, but the Father revealed[1] *the truth* (or, *a Voice from Heaven went forth*) *to the disciples, saying, This is my Chosen*[2]*: hear ye Him.*" It will be shewn (**871** *b*) that, whether in Greek or Hebrew tradition, "*He appeared* [*as*] *Moses*," may be indistinguishable from "*Moses appeared*", and similarly for "*Elijah*". Thus there is a *prima facie* case for explaining the alleged *apparitions of Moses and Elijah* (which John omits) as springing from *misunderstood traditions about the Prophet and the Messenger, which seemed to assert that "Moses and Elijah appeared.*" More cannot be said without anticipating the discussion that will follow more fitly later on. But so much as this will be of use if it prepares the reader to take a charitable view of John's omission of the whole narrative of the Transfiguration as well as of the Voice at the Baptism. By "charitable" it is meant to suggest that John may have acted as an honourable and truthful historian, in omitting what he believed to be non-historical. The account of the Baptism he may have rewritten because he believed he knew the facts: the Transfiguration he may have entirely omitted because he did not know the facts and believed the Synoptic account of them to be erroneous.

[1] [**849** *a*] "Revealed". A tradition peculiar to Matthew represents Jesus as saying in answer to Peter's Confession (Mt. xvi. 17) "Flesh and blood hath not *revealed* it unto thee, but *my Father* who is in heaven." In the Transfiguration, the revelation is made to three disciples and by a Voice from the Cloud.

[2] On "Chosen" as the original of "Son" see above **786–816**.

BOOK IV

THE SILENCE OF JOHN

CHAPTER I

THE VOICE AT THE BAPTISM, WHY OMITTED BY JOHN?

§ 1. *The Baptist's mission as described by Luke*

[**850**] THE Synoptic portion of Luke's Gospel begins with the words (iii. 2) "The word of God came (lit. "was") unto (lit. "upon", ἐπὶ) John." They at once raise a question. The formula "The word *of the Lord* came (lit. Heb. and Gk "was") *to*" this or that prophet &c. occurs in O.T. more than 100 times, but perhaps not more than two or three times with the preposition "upon" either in Hebrew or Greek[1]. "The word *of God* came," in the Hebrew text, occurs only twice, and there are Hebrew parallels in both cases having "the word *of the Lord*[2]." Consequently it appears that Luke not only uses a very rare definition of "*the word*", but also

---

[1] [**850** *a*] In this phrase, Heb. "*upon*" (עַל) (R.V. "to") appears to occur only in 1 Chr. xxii. 8, LXX μοι, A ἐπ' ἐμέ, and Jer. xxv. 1 ("the word [of the Lord]"), LXX πρός. In Jer. i. 1 "the word of Jeremiah," LXX has τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἱερ. In Dan. ix. 2 "to (אֶל)", Theod. has πρός, LXX has ἐπί and alters "word of the Lord" into "ordinance to the land."

[2] [**850** *b*] "*Came*", lit. "*was*", or "*came to pass*", Heb. הָיָה, Gk ἐγένετο. "The word of God *came*" occurs in 1 K. xii. 22 (=2 Chr. xi. 2), 1 Chr. xvii. 3 (=2 S. vii. 4). The LXX in both cases substitutes the usual Κύριος for the unusual θεός, but renders "word" by the unusual λόγος instead of the usual ῥῆμα. 1 Pet. i. 24 substitutes the usual τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου for Is. xl. 8 τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

describes its "coming" *in a manner practically unprecedented in LXX.* This is all the more remarkable because, up to this point, he has followed the LXX style. Moreover he seems to be aiming at extreme precision, as may be inferred from his giving us in the preceding words no less than six historical *data* ("In the fifteenth year.....Annas and Caiaphas") for determining the exact time and circumstances of Christ's entrance on the work of an Evangelist. It would be alien from Luke's custom to interpolate a clause of his own for the purpose of emphasizing the Baptist's testimony, and to express it in a phrase needlessly departing from Biblical usage. We are therefore bound to suppose—at all events as a preliminary supposition—that Luke had before him some ancient tradition that he felt compelled to interpret in these terms; and the first question to be asked is whether the earlier Gospels shew traces of any such original.

[**851**] The parallel in Mark is "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ [*the Son of God*]," where W.H. say that the bracketed words cannot "be safely rejected"[1]. This has the appearance of a conflation. Let us suppose a version of Mark containing "*the Son of God*" (instead of "*Jesus Christ*") and omitting the prophecies that come parenthetically in the second and third verses. The Gospel would then begin thus: "The Beginning of the Gospel *of the Son of God there-came* John." But, if this was expressed in New Hebrew, (i) "*of the Son*" would be דבר, which, in Biblical Hebrew, means "*the word of*"; (ii) "*there-came*" would be, in New Hebrew, על[2]. But this, in Biblical Hebrew, means "*upon*". Hence a student, familiar with Biblical but not with New Hebrew, might feel compelled to render this

[1] Unfortunately SS. and Diatess. are wanting for the beginning of Mk: otherwise they might support D, which has the bracketed words.

[2] [**851** *a*] Levy (*Ch.* ii. 218 *a*) "עלל prät. zumeist על...dass., was hbr. בוא."

as follows: "The Beginning of the Gospel. The *Word*[1] *of God* [*was*] *upon* John." From this, interpreting it as Biblical Hebrew, Luke may have derived his statement that the Baptist received a prophetic message from God.

[852] John makes no such statement; but he represents the Baptist as supporting it in the words (i. 33) "He that sent me to baptize *said unto me*.....[2]." Probably all Christians in the first century assumed that God "said" something to John about Christ, the only question being as to the precise nature of the "saying"—whether it was a general inspiration or a particular utterance. About this there might easily arise differences, as we see from the Targums on the first Biblical passage that mentions "the word of the Lord" (Gen. xv. 1—4).

(Heb.) "After these things (lit.) there-was the word of the Lord to Abram *in a vision* saying..... And behold the word of the Lord [was] to him saying,"

(Onk.) "There was the word of the Lord *with* Abram *in prophecy*.....and behold the word of the Lord [was] *with* him saying,"

(Jer. I) (Etheridge) "Thereupon was the word of the Lord *with* Abram *in a vision*.....and behold, a word *from before* the Lord was *to* him saying,"

(Jer. II) (Etheridge) "Then was the word of *prophecy* from the Lord *unto* (? עַל[3]) Abram" (ver. 4 is om.).

---

[1] [851 *b*] If John found such a tradition as, "*The Beginning of the Gospel* [*was*] *the Word of God*," he might have taken it as meaning "the beginning of the Plan of Spiritual Creation." This he may have had in mind in his opening words, "*In the beginning was the Word.*"

[2] Comp. I K. xviii. 31 "unto whom the word of the Lord came (lit. was)," ὡς ἐλάλησεν Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν.

[3] [852 *a*] Levy (*Ch.* ii. 85) renders עַל here by the German "an". As Aram. (Gesen. 757 *a*) does not use the Heb. preposition employed here, אֶל, the Targumist may substitute עַל with the same meaning, namely "*unto*". But such a practice is not mentioned by Levy (*Ch.* ii. 216 *a*) where the meanings of עַל are specified.

(LXX) "But after these words was the word of the Lord *to* (πρός) Abram *in a vision* saying.....and straightway a (or, the) *Voice* (φωνή) of the Lord was *to* (πρός) him saying."

[**853**] This last is almost the only passage[1] where the LXX renders the Hebrew "*word*" as if it were *Kol*, "*Voice*", which—when applied to God—would commonly denote either a *definite utterance* from heaven, Mount Sinai &c., or a *definite command* (as in "obey my *voice*, his *voice* &c."). The Diatessaron has, in rendering Luke here, "The *command* of God *went forth* to John." Having regard to the frequency with which "went forth" is applied (**740** foll.) to a Bath Kol, it is possible that the Arabic translator regarded the original as meaning that "a Voice from heaven *went forth* to John." In any case this tradition about "the word of God upon John" suggests the stages by which the utterance of a prophet, or a message given by God to a prophet in a vision[2], might come to be regarded as a Bath Kol[3].

§ 2. *The Baptist's mission as described by John*

[**854**] When an honest and competent historian, relating an event described by earlier historians, omits a very important detail inserted by his predecessors, every one will admit that there are *prima facie* grounds for supposing that the later writer believed the insertion to be non-historical. When the detail is a matter so stupendous as a Voice from Heaven, the supposition is greatly strengthened. But when

[1] Trommius gives also Gen. xi. 1.

[2] [**853** *a*] "Vision". A confusion between "*vision*" and "*prophecy*" might arise from a substitution like that in the Targums, which regularly substitute the latter for the former, as in Gen. xv. 1, quoted above, Is. i. 1, Hab. ii. 2 &c. (Levy, *Ch.* ii. 85 *b*).

[3] [**853** *b*] A Bath Kol is said by R. Jochanan to have been "given" *upon* him and his companions when they were sitting on Mount Sinai: but the Rabbi adds that it was in a dream, b. Chag. 14 *b*. The Voice said, "Come up hither, come up hither" (**1095**).

this same historian inserts another stupendous event—for example, a message from God to a prophet—which the earlier historians omit, then our supposition will naturally be changed. Is it not likely, we shall ask, that what the earlier writers regarded as a Bath Kol, or audible Voice "going out of a Voice" of God, the later regarded as *a divine inaudible voice —such as the Bible implies* when it says that "*the word of the Lord came*" *to this or that prophet?*

[855] An apparently unsurmountable obstacle, however, in the way of this harmonization of the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions, confronts us in the complete difference between the words of the Synoptic Voice and the words of the Johannine message. The voice says "*beloved Son*", or, more probably (in the Original) "*Chosen* One". Whichever version be adopted, this is quite different from the Johannine designation (i. 33) "*He that is to baptize with the Holy Spirit.*"

[856] It must be admitted at once that the literal Hebrew of "*baptize with the Holy Spirit*" could not possibly be misunderstood for the Hebrew of "*This is my beloved* (or, *chosen*) *Son.*" But it is not at all likely that the former phrase was used in its literal form by John the Baptist. At all events, it is not alleged by commentators to have been in Jewish use[1]; and, until the Church had brought it into vogue, it

[1] [856 *a*] Schöttgen (on Mt. iii. 11) quotes only a scoffing question from a Sadducee, "How did God wash Himself when He buried Moses?" The Rabbi answers "With fire". "*Did you ever*", replies the Sadducee, "*hear of washing with fire?*" The Rabbi then quotes Numb. xxxi. 23 "All that will not go into the fire thou shalt make to pass through the water." This single passage—and no others are alleged by Wetstein or Hor. Heb. *ad loc.*—so far from proving that the Jews were familiar with the phrase "baptism by fire", indicates *that there was no such phrase in use, and that the nearest equivalent the Rabbi could find was one that did not mention the word "dip", "wash", or "baptize".* Such a phrase as "washing, or baptizing, with fire" the Rabbi, apparently, had never heard. If he had, his answer to the question "Did you ever hear?" would have been "Yes, frequently".

would probably have seemed as strange to Jews as "wash in the Spirit", or "wash in wind", to us. Moreover the fact that Matthew and Luke add to "the Holy Spirit" the words "and fire"—which are omitted by Mark and John —indicates that the Original contained some difficult metaphor, denoting a severe purification, but capable of being variously understood and expressed.

§ 3. *The Original? The "Refiner"?*

[**857**] Many of the variations might be explained on the hypothesis of an original metaphor about "*soap*" (or "*lye*") such as occurs in Malachi's prophecy about the Messenger, (Mal. iii. 2) "He is like the fire of a refiner and *like the soap* of fullers," which may be compared with Isaiah (marg.) (i. 25) "I will purge away thy dross *as* [*with*] *lye*" and Job (marg.) (ix. 30) "cleanse my hands with *lye*." Malachi's Hebrew for "*soap*", בֹּרִית, differs but little from בְּרוּחַ "*with the Spirit*". Again, Isaiah's Hebrew for "*lye*", "*purification*", "*purity*" &c., is identical with the New Hebrew for "*Son*", and this has actually produced ambiguity in an important Messianic Psalm, portions of which have greatly influenced early Christian writings (Ps. ii. 12) (R.V.) "Kiss *the Son* (marg. *in purity*")[1], where the LXX perhaps takes the meaning to be "chastening". Again, in Proverbs (xxxi. 2) "My *son*", where the R.V. gives no alternative, Jewish Tradition takes the word as typifying Israel under the figure of "*pure* or *fine* [*wheat*][2]."

[1] [**857** *a*] Aquila (Gesen. 135) has "in *purity*"; LXX, by some error, or by paraphrase, has "*training*", παιδεία (? "chastening"). Portions of this Psalm are quoted in Acts iv. 25, xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5, Rev. xii. 5, xix. 15; and Ps. ii. 7 "This day have I begotten thee" (**792–7**) represents the Voice from Heaven at the Baptism in several Christian authorities: בר means in Bibl. Heb. "lye", "purity", but in N. Heb. "son": Is. i. 25 "as [with] lye", כבר = N. Heb. "as a son".

[2] Levy i. 259 *b*, ii. 35 *b*.

§ 4. *Ambiguities connected with the "Refiner"*

[858] It will be observed that "*lye*" is connected above by Isaiah with purification of metal, *i.e.* by *fire*, but by Job with purification of the hands, *i.e.* by *water*. The term is therefore ambiguous. In Isaiah, the verb used with "*lye*" is "*purify-by-fire*", which would prevent ambiguity. But a Targum on the Isaiah passage substitutes the more general "*purify*"—which is the root of "*lye*", "*soap*", "*purification*", "*fine* (*wheat*)" &c., but is also applied to the refining of gold[1]. Hence, if the Original had "He shall purify *as* [*with*] *lye*", some might add as a marginal explanation "*with fire*". This might be subsequently added to the text, thus originating the clause "and (or, even) *with fire*[2]." Then might be appended an explanation of the object of this "*fire*", namely to *burn up the chaff* "*with fire unquenchable*"—an addition found in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark and John. Others, who adopted the longer form used by Malachi and who read it as "*wind*" or "*Spirit*", might add a different comment, namely that it referred to *the winnowing fan that was to separate the chaff from the wheat*[3].

[859] This might be combined with the metaphor of "fire", as it is combined by Matthew and Luke but not by Mark and John. In this way, *the original metaphor of refining metal would be supplanted by the metaphor of purifying or refining wheat.* John might feel that the metaphorical "as [with] lye", even though it had been in the first instance

[1] [858 *a*] Levy, *Ch.* i. 117 *b*, Levy i. 272 *b*: Bibl. "*purify-by-fire*", צרף, Targ. "*purify*", ברר.

[2] [858 *b*] In Is. i. 25 (Buhl 123 *b*, *Encycl. B.* 2840) some read בכר "*in the furnace*" for כבר "*like lye*". This might be paraphrased as "*with fire*".

[3] [858 *c*] See 340 *a*, where it was suggested that (Is. xxx. 24) רחת, "*winnowing-fan*", or some other obscure prophetic expression, is needed to explain the phenomena. But the facts are better explained by ברית "*soap*" (or "*lye*"), the word used by Malachi.

erroneously rendered by Mark "with the Spirit" (owing to a slight confusion of Hebrew letters), was nevertheless represented by the latter phrase with substantial accuracy. While Mark's Gospel was new to the Church, the comments added by Matthew and Luke were needed to interpret "lye" or "soap" as meaning the purification that was to separate good from evil and to destroy the latter. But now that Christians were familiar with the conception of the all-searching Holy Spirit, there might seem no need to add further comments. Moreover the transference of these comments to the Baptist as though they were uttered by him may have seemed to John erroneous. These feelings may have induced the latter to confine himself to Mark's paraphrastic tradition without adopting the comment of Matthew and Luke, and without adding any comment of his own.

[860] Again, the ambiguous בר, besides meaning "*son*" and "*lye*" &c., derives also from the radical notion of the word ("*separate*", "*sift*", "*select*" &c.) the adjectival meaning "*select*" or "*chosen*". It is thrice rendered thus by LXX (ἐκλεκτός), once when meaning (Amos v. 11 R.V.) "wheat", but twice when applied to spotless beauty, or purity, of a woman (Cant. vi. 9) "the *choice* one" (marg. "*pure*"), (*ib.* vi. 10) "*clear*" (marg. "*pure*"). Now we have seen above that in the Fourth Gospel, though the Baptist's testimony to Jesus is given by most authorities as "I have borne witness that this is *the Son* of God," yet there are good reasons for preferring the various reading "*the Chosen* of God." This, then, is one more of the complex phenomena that could be explained by the hypothesis of an original allusion to the Refiner or Purifier.

[861] So much for the probable Original of the last part of "This is he that is to baptize *with the Holy Spirit*." But if the last part was originally "*as* [*with*] *lye*", it almost follows that the first part was originally "he that is to *refine*, or *purify*." We have seen (**858** *a*) that a Targum expressed

"*refine*" by the more general word "*purify*", ברר. Now this word also means "*choose*"—frequently in the Bible as rendered by LXX, and still more frequently in New Hebrew[1]. And the passive participle, "*Chosen*" (or "*Elect*"), "*Purified*", is easily confused with the active participle, the *Purifier* or *Refiner*. Hence it appears quite possible that the original testimony of the Baptist to Jesus has not been preserved either in the reading "*Son* of God" or in the reading "*Chosen* of God", and that it was "*the Refiner* of God," *i.e.* the Messenger, or Messiah, predicted by Malachi as coming suddenly to the Temple to "*purify* the sons of Levi." This view would have, at all events, the advantage of harmonizing the testimony given by the Baptist with the divine message to the Baptist, the message being, in effect, "He on whom thou shalt see the Spirit abide, *he is the Purifier*, or *Refiner*, of the House of God," the testimony, "I saw the Spirit abide on him and I testify that *he is the Refiner*."

§ 5. "*Refiner*", *perhaps, superseded by* "*Chosen*" *or* "*Son*"

[**862**] The vision of the Refiner of the sons of Levi was a natural one for John the son of Zachariah the Priest, but Christians could not be expected to give it prominence. The Fourth Gospel does indeed suggest it somewhat more clearly than the Three by placing the Purification of the Temple at the very outset, as the first of Christ's public acts, "suddenly coming to His temple,"—without the triumphant entry prefixed to it by the Synoptists: but it was inevitable that after Christ's Resurrection, this aspect of His work should be subordinated. Perhaps the fate of the Temple—*not* "purified" by the "Refiner", but destroyed by the Romans—when combined with above-mentioned uncertainties about the personality of the Messenger and the Refiner, would cause

[1] [**861** *a*] Trommius gives forms of ברר as=ἐκλέγομαι (3), ἐκλεκτός (9), καθαρός (1), ἀφορίζομαι (1), παρασκευάζω (1). See below **863** *a*.

Malachi's reference to the "Temple", and the "Messenger" visiting it, to fall into disuse among Christians. At all events we have found (**837**) Clement of Rome the only Ante-Nicene Father quoting Malachi's description of the coming to the Temple; and he misquotes it. He also refers it not to the Purification of the Temple nor to any act of Christ's life on earth, but to the Second Coming.

[**863**] Hence the above-mentioned identities or similarities between the Hebrew words implying the *Refiner* and those implying the *Son*—and also the possibilities of confusing "chosen" with "purifying"—would find Christian Evangelists predisposed to interpret all doubtful phrases in a high Messianic sense that would depart from the old-fashioned metaphor. The Targums on the Pentateuch shew how the notions of "*purify*", "*choose*", and "to be well-pleased[1]," may be interchanged, without any doctrinal motive; and the two latter have been shown above (**813**) to be interchanged in the Chronicler's description of the choosing of David. Supposing, therefore, that some Hebrew Gospel blended the metaphor of Malachi with the technical term of Isaiah, describing the Refiner as coming to "*purify like lye*, or, *like soap*," it does not require much imagination to perceive the host of glosses that would spring up round such a phrase in later times when the Refiner was identified with the Messiah, and with the Son of God.

[**864**] First among these would perhaps be "the *Chosen*", since that was the appellation of the Messiah in the Book of Enoch. Then "*Chosen*" would suggest Isaiah's words, "My *servant*.....my *Chosen*," which, in their Greek form, might be,

[1] [**863** *a*] Numb. xvi. 5 "whom he shall *choose*," Targ. Jer. (Etheridge) "it hath *pleased* him"; xvi. 7 "doth *choose*", Targ. Jer. "shall *make known*" (leg. ברר, "separate" and hence "distinguish", "make known", "make manifest"). Hence such a phrase as "for the sake of the *Purifier* of Israel" might easily be confused with "for the sake of His *being made manifest* to Israel" (comp. Jn i. 31).

"my *son* whom *I have chosen*"; and we have seen above how naturally this would become "my *beloved Son*". Such traditions as these may be described as honest various readings. Far less justifiable appears the tradition adopted by Justin and Clement of Alexandria, "This day have I begotten thee" —which, however, may have been in the first instance added, orally or in writing, as an illustration rather than as an essential portion of the history. In any case, all these various versions of a Voice from Heaven are almost certainly unhistorical. There is also a very strong probability that they sprang from an utterance of the Baptist, who is said by John to have described himself as being a *Voice*, and as having received a message from God[1]. Finally, as to the message itself, there is a fair probability that it may have referred to the Refiner of the sons of Levi predicted by Malachi[2].

[1] [**864** *a*] Origen says that the Voice at the Baptism (Cels. ii. 72) "is *not stated to have been audible to the multitude.*" This does not admit, but it implies, that it was audible to none but John the Baptist. Such a "Voice", being subjective, would be more commonly called "the Word of God coming to a prophet" than a "Voice from Heaven".

[2] [**864** *b*] Schöttgen (ii. 263) quotes Midr. Tehill. on Ps. xciii. 1, that God has "seven *garments*" and that "the seventh is in the times of Messiah," because (Dan. vii. 9) "His *garment* was *white as snow*," and (*ib.* ii. 555, comp. 194) Siphra in Jalk. Sim. I. fol. 166 *b*, II. fol. 58 *a*, that God took all the sins of Jacob and Esau and poured them on His own *garments*, whence it was asked (Is. lxiii. 1) "Wherefore are thy *garments red*?" Then He sat down and washed them *white*, and (Dan. vii. 9) "His *garment* was *white as snow*." These facts suggest that the "*fuller*", mentioned by Mark (ix. 3) alone—and omitted or corrupted in many vss. and MSS.—had originally a spiritual significance. Other facts, for which there is no space here, suggest that Heb. corruption has conflated בר, "lye", as "*son*" and "*word* (דבר)"; and that Gk corruption in the *Acts of John* (§ 5) has conflated "lye" (*i.e.* ποα or ποια) as πολα(c), ποιαc and οποιον. See *Corrections* **522** (iv) *a*, **522** (vii), which approaches this hypothesis; but I now think (contrary to **421**) that Mt. xvii. 2, Lk. ix. 29 "*his face*" is wrong, and that Mk ix. 2 "before them", *i.e.* "before *their face*", is right.

CHAPTER II

THE VOICE AT THE TRANSFIGURATION, WHY OMITTED BY JOHN?

§ 1. *A Physical Hypothesis, unsatisfactory*

[865] If a biographer of a mediaeval Saint omitted such an event as the Transfiguration—in spite of its being recorded by three previous biographers recognized as authoritative—we should be disposed to infer, without much additional evidence, that he regarded the event as a non-miraculous fact exaggerated into a miracle. No doubt it is difficult —assuming the honesty of the first reporters of the event and of the earliest Evangelists—to see how Peter's ecstatic utterance[1] could have arisen without some basis of fact. But such a basis might be found without difficulty.

[866] Three disciples, James, John, and Peter, are said by the Synoptists to have been on a mountain. As they do not descend till the next day[2], they may be presumed to have been there at sun-rise. Their Master is said to have been praying. They, therefore, may be supposed to have been watching, standing a little apart. Recall the striking apparitions witnessed by travellers and mountain-climbers not only

[1] Mk ix. 5 "Master, it is good for us to be here, and let us make three tabernacles, one for thee and one for Moses and one for Elijah," comp. Mt. xvii. 4, Lk. ix. 33.

[2] Lk. ix. 37.

on the heights of the Brocken, but also among the Swiss Alps and in the English Lake District. Assume a wind from the west and a cloud moving eastward approaching the disciples as it approached Elijah on Mount Carmel. The result might be in the first place three spectral figures seen by the disciples as they turned towards the west, one with a halo round the head[1]; then a clap of thunder, such as the Psalmist would have called (**727–9**) the Voice of the Lord; then the nearer approach and arrival of the cloud, simultaneously enveloping the beholders and swallowing up the mysterious figures. The cloud passes on to the east, and the apparition has vanished. They look eastward and see Jesus standing alone. What is wanting, it may be asked, in this hypothesis? The definition of the three figures by Peter and his companions as Moses, Elijah, and Jesus, and the conversion of the thunder into an articulate utterance from heaven—which might be illustrated by the conversion of the Johannine Voice from Heaven into thunder—might not these illusions arise, in strict accordance with the laws of human nature and science, in hearts filled and heated with spiritual prepossession?

[**867**] On the other hand, the Brocken phenomenon may be an impossibility in the present climate of Palestine, and may also have been so even when the country was better wooded and watered than at present. Again, if the Synoptic narrative represents a fact, though an illusive fact, then the three leading Apostles, including John the son of Zebedee, were deceived by this illusion. If so—such scientific or quasi-scientific explanations as the one given above being impossible anachronisms for the first century—how could any apostle or

[1] [**866** *a*] Many such experiences were attested by letters from correspondents of repute in the *Spectator* of 1901 (Sept.—Dec.): and the facts do not appear to be questioned or questionable. In particular, the halo seen round the head of one of the figures was mentioned by several witnesses. Even supposing all these witnesses were deluded, might not others be deluded eighteen or nineteen centuries ago?

disciple fail to believe it, and, believing it, how could any evangelist fail to record it?[1] The author of the Fourth Gospel might feel, perhaps, that the facts did not quite satisfy his conception of what the situation demanded; but still, had he been convinced of their truth, it appears impossible that he could have omitted them, or some version of them, constituting as they do a centre, or crisis, in Christ's career. A third objection is, that this kind of solution does not explain a great mass of miracles, such as Samson's spring that rose out of the ass's jaw-bone and the miracles of Gideon's fleece in the Old Testament, and some in the New Testament, which can be traced to linguistic error: and, although it would be absurd to deny antecedently the possibility of illusive error as another cause of such narratives, yet it is not absurd to bid the illusive theory stand aside, as it were, with a request to wait: "Let us see, first, whether the phenomena may not be explained by the usual cause."

[868] Proceeding, then, to an investigation on the hypothesis of linguistic error, we have first to ask, what words in the Synoptic account are both testified to identically by the three Synoptists, and are most likely, from internal evidence, to go back closest to the historical fact. If the words are startling, certain to be turned against the Christian cause by its enemies and to necessitate apologies from its friends, so much the better for our purpose; for then the

[1] [867 *a*] The climate of the mountain would of course depend on the mountain. The Gospels do not mention the mountain's name. Tradition is silent till the 4th century. Cyril (A.D. 350) (*Cat.* xii. 16, Hastings iv. 671) makes it Tabor, and so does Jerome (A.D. 386) (*Ep. Paul.* xvii; cf. *Ep. ad Mar.* viii., Hastings, *ib.*). But "the Bordeaux Pilgrim" (A.D. 333, *ib.*) makes it the Mount of Olives. "The choice of Tabor," says Swete (on Mk ix. 2), "was unfortunate", because it was "not 1000 feet above the plain" and "crowned by a fortress," and he prefers "Hermon, which rises to the height of 9200 feet." The variations, and others mentioned later on, favour the view that the "mountain" had no physical existence (981).

words could not have sprung out of an explanatory gloss, still less could they have been invented by a zealous evangelist. All these conditions are satisfied by the exclamation of Peter about the "three tabernacles". This has been so differently treated by early theologians, and reference will have to be made to it so frequently, that it must be given in full: "Rabbi, it is good for us to be here, and let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah[1]." These words have every stamp of authenticity. They are so amazing that we feel them to be the natural product of ecstasy. As the result of cold-blooded explanation on the part of evangelist or editor, they are absolutely incredible. They appear to be condemned by the Voice from Heaven. They are apologized for, as it were, by two of the very Evangelists that record them, and they are bitterly attacked by Origen as coming from Satan[2]. We may therefore take them as our safest approach to history. Not, of course, that we commit ourselves to every syllable of them; but the substance appears solid. *Something*—we may feel sure—was said by Peter about Jesus in connection with "*Moses*" and "*Elijah*" and a "*building of tabernacles*". This may be taken as fact, and as a basis for seeking further facts.

§ 2. *Origen's view: the Transfiguration subjective*

[869] Origen, commenting on the close of the Transfiguration, says of the disciples, "After the touch of the Word, lifting up their eyes, they saw Jesus only and no other. Moses, the Law, and Elijah, the Prophets, we find to have *become only one with Jesus*, the Gospel. Whereas they were formerly three, we find them not to have remained three,

[1] Mk ix. 5, comp. Mt. xvii. 4, Lk. ix. 33.

[2] Mark says (ix. 6) "He knew not what to answer," Luke (ix. 33) "Not knowing what he was saying." As to Origen, see next section.

but the three to have become one[1]." He also lays stress on the subjective nature of the Transfiguration, and in particular on "*before them*"—in the words recorded by Mark and Matthew but omitted by Luke—"He was metamorphosed *before them*[2]." From these he infers that it was possible for Jesus to be metamorphosed in this way, "*before*" *some, and yet at the same time, not* "*before*" *others.* In the same subjective way he interprets the apparitions of Moses and Elijah to the disciples. If anyone, he says, beholds Jesus revealed as the Son of God, there will appear to him Moses, *i.e.* the Law, and Elijah, *i.e.* the Prophets. Luke says, "Moses and Elijah appeared to them *in glory*." This is interpreted by Origen as meaning *in the glory of Law and Prophecy,* as revealed spiritually in Christ; and hence a believer, so Origen says, "sees Moses and Elijah '*in glory*' *when he sees them with Jesus.*"

[870] In most cases, Origen's allegorical interpretations of alleged fact are mere moralizing, and he is only a spiritual guide: but where the alleged fact may not be real fact, but may have sprung out of allegory, this spiritual guide may unconsciously serve as a historical guide by taking us back to the actual source of the narrative. And there are grounds for thinking that it may be so in the present instance. When Jesus says, "They have *Moses and the Prophets*, let them hear them," everyone knows that the phrase means the Scriptures, like the similar expression in the Sermon on the Mount, where it is said concerning the rule of neighbourliness, "This is *the Law and the Prophets.*" When Jesus said to the Twelve, "Will ye also depart?"[3] Peter is said to have

[1] [869 *a*] *Comm. Matth.* lib. xii. ch. 43 (Huet p. 303 A). "We find" is an attempt to render the perfects, γέγονε, μεμονήκασιν, and γεγόνασιν. Origen adds that this relates to the *spiritual* action; for, "in regard to *the bare meaning of the letter*," Moses and Elijah departed to the place whence they had come.

[2] *Ib.* ch. 37 (p. 297 C).

[3] Jn vi. 67–9.

exclaimed, "Lord, to whom shall we go? *Thou hast words of eternal life*, and we have a fixed faith and knowledge that thou art the Holy One of God." If this were expressed in personal metaphor, frequent among the Jews, the result might be very similar to the language of Origen.

[871] Even concerning an ordinary Rabbi an admiring pupil says, "I saw the son of Pedath sitting and searching the Scriptures *even as Moses from the mouth of the Mighty One*[1]": and the name of Moses is said to have been used metaphorically to represent a great teacher[2]. If therefore it could be said, even of Stephen's enemies, that before his martyrdom they "beheld his face as it had been the face of an angel," there is nothing inconceivable, or even hyperbolical, in the supposition that Peter, being present on some special occasion while our Lord was preparing Himself by prayer for the future Sacrifice, felt in his heart a rush of conviction that here, before his eyes, was the climax of the Law and the Prophets, "*Thou art to us Moses, thou art to us Elijah, and let us build three tabernacles, one for thee* [*as thyself*] *and one for* [*thee as*] *Moses, and one for* [*thee as*] *Elijah.*" These impassioned words, being reduced to narrative along with a statement that *He* "*appeared to some, or to Peter and those with Him, as Moses and Elijah,*" might easily result in a statement in which "*as*" was omitted, "*There appeared to them Moses and Elijah,*" with subsequent explanations and amplifications for clearness[3].

---

[1] Levy iii. 268 *b*.

[2] [871 *a*] Levy (iii. 269 *a*) gives several instances. But the name is always used vocatively, and the quotations do not make it clear that the meaning might not be adjurative, "[By the life of] Moses!" as Levy renders it in other instances.

[3] [871 *b*] Comp. *Acts of John*, § 2, πολλάκις δέ μοι καὶ μικρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐμφαίνεται δύσμορφος καὶ.... By itself, this would naturally be rendered "Oftentimes *there appears to me also a little illshaped man.*" But it means, as the context shews, "*Jesus appears to me both* [*as*] *a little illshaped man and* [*as*] *one....*" Hebrew often omits "*as*" where the full

[872] How easily "some said he was Elijah," or "he appeared to some Elijah," might be interchanged with "there appeared Elijah", may be inferred from a passage before the Transfiguration, describing the common talk about Jesus:—

Mk vi. 15	Mt. om.	Lk. ix. 8
"But others said that *he was Elijah* (Ἠλείας ἐστίν); but others said that [*he was*] *a prophet, as* one of the prophets."		"But by some [it was said] that *Elijah* [*had*] *appeared*, but by others that *a prophet* of the ancient [prophets] *had arisen* [*from the dead*]."

[873] With this should be compared the following, which is in answer to Christ's question as to what name people gave to Him:—

Mk viii. 28 (lit.)	Mt. xvi. 14	Lk ix. 19
"But they said to him saying that [some say] John the Baptist, and others Elijah, but others that [thou art] one of the prophets."	"But they said, Some John the Baptist, but others Elijah, but others-again (ἕτεροι) Jeremiah or one of the prophets."	"But they answering said, John the Baptist, but others Elijah, but others that a prophet of the ancient [prophets] has arisen [from the dead]."

[874] The following explanation may be given of Matthew's omission of the first of these two passages. The same Hebrew phrase may mean "There *were* some that *said*" or "There *are* some that *say*[1]." Matthew may have con-

sense would require it, as in Is. xl. 6, "all flesh is grass," quoted 1 Pet. i. 24 "is *as* grass", Hab. i. 11 "shall sweep by [*as*] a wind," marg. "the wind shall sweep by," Is. xlvii. 3 "I will not accept a man" (A.V. "I will not meet thee [*as a*] man"), Sir. vi. 31 "Thou shalt crown thyself with her [*as a*] crown of beauty," LXX om. "*as*".

[1] [874*a*] In Neh. v. 2—4 "*There were that* (יש) said" occurs thrice: LXX has once "*were*", but twice "*are*", so as to give the meaning "there *are* some that *say*": יש is mostly present.

sidered the former passage a duplicate of the latter, believing the right rendering to be "There *are* some that *say*."

This double meaning may make a serious difference if it converts a statement of what was *actually said by some persons in past times* into a statement of an *opinion about a doubtful point expressed by some persons at the time when the scribe is writing*. Thus "There *were* some that *said* [sixty years ago when Jesus was on earth] 'Elijah has appeared,'" might be converted into a statement of present opinion, "There *are* some that *say* that Elijah appeared [visibly]" on such and such an occasion.

§ 3. *Mark lends itself to the subjective hypothesis*

[875] A comparison of Mark with Matthew, and of both with Luke, will shew that the subjective view—almost lost in Matthew, and carefully guarded against by Luke—remains, though slightly obscured, in the earliest Gospel, *i.e.* Mark. Mark has (ix. 2—5) "*He was metamorphosed before them* [i.e. *the disciples*]...*and* [*there*] *appeared to them Elijah with Moses.* And *they* were conversing with Jesus, and Peter answered and said to Jesus...." This is compatible with the view that Jesus was changed in appearance *so that the disciples saw Him as though He were Elijah with Moses, without any actual presence of the Prophet and the Lawgiver*; and then, while "*they*", i.e. *the disciples*, were conversing with Jesus, Peter exclaimed that three tabernacles were to be built.

[876] Matthew has (xvii. 2—4) "He was metamorphosed before them...and behold, *appeared* (ὤφθη) (*sing.*) to them Moses and Elijah *conversing* (*pl.*) *with him.* But Peter answered and said...." Here, up to the word "conversing", the singular verb, "appeared", would allow us to take the words as we took them in Mark. But the plural "conversing" makes it necessary to suppose that Moses and Elijah were the conversers. Then, by inference, it follows that although

"appeared" is singular, it must nevertheless have for its subject "Moses and Elijah" (an unusual though possible construction). Thus the narrative is converted to a statement that Moses and Elijah appeared to the disciples and conversed with Jesus[1].

[877] Luke goes much further in definiteness. Probably, in his time, there were current a great number of explanatory, or exaggerative, traditions, from which he had to select the most trustworthy. For example, the *Acts of John* (§ 3—6) has (**1072–3**) two versions of a glorification, or transformation, on "the mountain"—where no apparition is introduced; but Peter and James, in the second, fancy they hear someone (possibly John) conversing with Jesus. Immediately afterwards it describes an apparition discoursing with Jesus, not however now on "the mountain" but at "Gennesaret" (perhaps (**960** *b*) an error for what Mark and Matthew call "Gethsemane" but Luke "the Mount of Olives"). The first version of the Transfiguration describes all the three Apostles as beholding the "light". The second describes the three as beholding Jesus "praying", but only John as witnessing the transformation. The account of the apparition at "Gennesaret" says "I [*i.e.* John] *alone*[2] watched." It also describes how John "*kept awake*", though Jesus bade him go to sleep. In a very different sense, an early tradition quoted by Clement of Alexandria says that Peter and James and John, in accordance with Christ's prediction made just before the

[1] [**876** *a*] For the ambiguity supposed in the Original, compare Zech. vi. 13 "And he shall sit and rule upon his throne; and *he shall be a priest* upon his throne," marg. "and *there shall be a priest.*" The LXX, taking the latter view, paraphrases the second "upon his throne" as "by his throne", *i.e.* "upon his right hand" ("and there shall be the priest on his right hand"), thus committing itself definitely to the statement that there are *two* persons, where perhaps the writer meant only *one.*

[2] [**877** *a*] Comp. the Arabic Diatessaron (on Mk ix. 4) "There appeared *unto him* Moses and Elijah talking to Jesus." Here "*him*", if it referred to the person last mentioned, would mean Jesus.

Transfiguration ("There are some of those standing here who shall surely not taste of *death until* they see the Son of man in glory[1]"), consequently "saw it *and* [*then*] *fell asleep*." In other words, they saw the glory of Christ *before they died*. The *Acts of John*, also, does not mention Moses and Elijah, but only *one person*, unnamed, as speaking with the Lord on the top of the mountain.

[878] With these facts premised, the reader will be better able to understand the attitude of an Evangelist attempting, as Luke attempts, to treat the matter historically. He emphasizes certain statements of *fact*, e.g. not *one* person but "*two*", and not two *phantasms*, but "two *men* (ἄνδρες)". The words (Lk. ix. 31) "in *glory*" might mean "in *opinion*", and seem to be so understood by the Arabic Diatessaron[2]. They might also mean "in *fancy*," or "in a *vision*". But Luke, by adding "*saw his glory*", clearly defines them. Possibly also by his mention of "*sleep*" and his obscure addition about "*remaining awake*" (or "*when they were fully awake*") he may intend to indicate that, although there was some foundation for the tradition that the incident was a dream or trance, yet it was not really one. Luke even tells us the subject about which Jesus, Moses, and Elijah were "conversing". Lastly, he explains Peter's desire to construct three tabernacles by saying that he expressed it when Moses and Elijah were in the act of passing away from Jesus, implying that Peter wished them to remain :—

[879] Lk. ix. 30—33 "And behold, *two men were conversing* with him, who were Moses and Elijah, who, appearing *in glory*[3], were speaking of his departure, which he was about

[1] [877 *a*] Clem. Alex. (967) "in glory", not exactly agreeing with any of the Synoptists.

[2] [878 *a*] "And *they thought* that the time of his decease which was to be accomplished at Jerusalem was come."

[3] [879 *a*] Lk. omits "to them" (Mk-Mt. "appeared *to them*"), probably as suggesting a subjective element.

to accomplish in Jerusalem. But Peter and those with him were heavy with sleep; but *when they were fully awake*[1] (or, *having remained awake*) they saw *his glory* and *the two men* that were standing (?) with him[2]. And it came to pass when they *were being separated from him*, Peter said to Jesus...."

§ 4. *St Paul favours the subjective hypothesis*

[880] From the last section it appears that Luke, the latest of the Synoptists, emphasizes the objective nature of the apparitions at the Transfiguration. He takes what may be called the later Jewish view of the "glory" in which Moses and Elijah appeared. It may be illustrated by a tradition about the great Rabbi Eliezer: "While he was teaching, rays came forth from his face, *as formerly from the face of Moses*, so that one could not tell whether it was day or night[3]." Another story tells how Rabbi Simeon called heaven and earth to witness that he beheld what no man had seen from the day when Moses ascended Sinai for the second time: "I see my face shining like the splendour of the sun in its strength, which hath gone forth to the healing of the earth[4]."

---

[1] "Fully awake" (see **884** *a*).

[2] [**879** *b*] R.V. "Standing with". Συνεστώς occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in 2 Pet. iii. 5 "framed" (and συνέστηκε only in Col. i. 17 "consist"). Why does not Lk. use the regular word παρεστώς? Does he wish to suggest "closely united with"? This view is suggested by Greek usage and by Tertullian (*Marc.* iv. 22) "Petrus merito *contubernium* Christi sui agnoscens [? in] *individuitate ejus*." Clark renders this, "Peter, when recognizing the *companions* of his Christ *in their indissoluble connection* with him." In the canonical LXX, συστῆναι seldom means simply "stand near" (apart from "combining", "leaguing", &c.) perhaps only in 1 S. xvii. 26 (A) where μετ' αὐτοῦ is added. Comp. Origen above quoted (**869**) "*the three became one*."

[3] Wetst. (Mt. xvii. 2).

[4] Schöttg., on Acts vi. 15 "as the face of an angel," which he illustrates by many quotations, beginning from Gen. xxxiii. 10.

[881] A late Jewish comment expressly contrasts the awful splendour of Moses with the mild and inferior illumination of Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration: "Behold, Moses our Master, of blessed memory, who was mere man, yet, because God spake with him face to face, brought back from His presence a countenance shining in such wise that the Jews feared to approach him. How much more must this needs be about the Divine Nature itself! Surely the face of Jesus [had he been divine] should have diffused splendour from pole to pole! But he was not endowed with any splendour but was in all points like other mortals. Wherefore it is certain that men ought not to believe in him[1]." This way of thinking is very natural to those who identify "glory" with fear-inspiring manifestations: and, though this Jewish comment is of late origin, it can be shewn that Clement of Alexandria (or more probably an earlier author quoted by him) realized and tried to meet an objection very similar (Clem. Alex. 967) "How was it that they [the three Apostles] were not struck with astonishment by seeing the appearance (or, face) (ὄψιν) bathed-in-light, yet, when they heard the Voice, they fell on the earth?" His answer is: "Because ears are less trustworthy than eyes, and the Voice that comes unexpectedly strikes us with more astonishment." Certainly, as compared with this defence, the Jewish attack has the best of it.

[882] The Jew has in his mind the description of Moses receiving the two stone tables of the Law from God on Mount Sinai and descending with a countenance so illuminated by God's glory that the Israelites were afraid to come nigh him until he called them. The Scripture there uses thrice a very striking expression (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35) "the skin of his face *became-horned*," i.e. "sent forth horns, or rays, of light." This is paraphrased by Onkelos, "(how) great was

[1] Nizzachon vetus, p. 40 ad Exod. xxxiv. 33, quoted by Wetstein (on Mt. xvii. 2).

the splendour of the glory of his countenance," by the Jerusalem Targum (I) (once), "shone with *the splendour that had come upon him from the brightness of the glory of the Lord's Shekinah*," by the Jerusalem Targum (II) (once), "*the beams* of his face *did shine*," by the LXX (thrice) "was glorified". St Paul, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, refers to, and quotes (though very freely) the LXX version of this passage, in order to shew that all this visible "glory" of the Law was a poor thing compared with the spiritual glory of the Gospel. The two tables of stone, he says, are now replaced by the Tables of the heart; the Law was wont to condemn to death, the Gospel justifies to life; the "glory" of the countenance of Moses lasted only while he was speaking to the people. When Moses "had done speaking unto them, he put a veil on his face," says the Hebrew text of Exodus; and the reason St Paul gives for this is "that the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of that which was passing away" (2 Cor. iii. 3—13).

[**883**] These words of St Paul are followed by a passage apparently alluding to a Greek tradition about the *Metamorphosis*, or *Transformation* (commonly called Transfiguration[1]), of Christ. We may reasonably infer the allusion partly from the fact that the Apostle uses the extremely rare word "*metamorphose*"—nowhere used at all in the LXX and nowhere in N.T. except in the Synoptic account of the Transfiguration and one other Pauline passage presently to be mentioned—but still more from the contextual mention of the "glory" of the "countenance" of Moses as compared with the glory of the Messiah. Returning to the metaphor of the veil in Exodus—and perhaps alluding to the fact that Moses put off the veil as often as he went into the presence of

[1] [**883** *a*] "Transformation", instead of "transfiguration", is used in this paragraph, because the object is to shew that *the word used by Mark and by St Paul is identical, namely*, "*transform*", the word used by R.V. in the Pauline Epistles.

God—St Paul draws the moral that when Israel will "turn to the Lord" the veil shall be taken away from its heart. Then he says that "the Lord" here means "the Spirit"; and he contrasts the Mosaic fitful entering into the Lord's presence with the Christian ideal of constant residence in the Spirit, for the Spirit is the very home of freedom[1]. Then come the words, "But we all, with unveiled face[2], mirroring the glory of the Lord, are being in the same likeness *transformed* (lit. *metamorphosed*) from glory to glory in such wise as [might be

[1] [883 *b*] 2 Cor. iii. 17 "But where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." Perhaps this is to be illustrated, not so much by Ps. li. 12 "a free spirit", as by Jn iii. 7 "The wind, or Spirit, bloweth where it listeth." Ephrem (p. 155) says that the Spirit spoke through Peter what Peter did not know (Lk. ix. 33 "not knowing what he said") "although in this saying *freedom* is associated with the Spirit (etsi in hoc verbo libertas cum Spiritu associetur)," an obscure expression explained by Moesinger as an allusion to Mt. xvii. 4 "if thou wilt". The coincidence with 2 Cor. iii. 17 is at all events worth noting.

[2] [883 *c*] "With unveiled face". A non-Jewish reader may fail to see in this phrase the undoubtedly existent allusion to "freedom". Levy (*Ch.* ii. 423 *a*) quotes ברייש גלי "with *head uncovered*", as a Targum on Exod. xiv. 8, Numb. xxxiii. 3 (referring to deliverance by Jehovah "with hand uplifted") and renders it "*as free men*, whereas slaves in presence of their master must go with head covered." The Jewish critic above quoted (881) *found fault with the statement that the Apostles could look on the glory of Christ; St Paul restates it as a sign of "freedom"*.

It is interesting to find in the *Acts of John* traces of this Jewish phrase and of a misunderstanding arising out of one of its Biblical equivalents. The Deliverance described in Lev. xxvi. 13 "and made you go *upright*," is paraphrased in New Hebrew (Levy iv. 264 *b*) "with raised up *stature*," but in Targum Hebrew "with head *uncovered*". Following the New Hebrew, certain Rabbis argued (Levy iii. 98) that in the Messianic Kingdom men would be two hundred ells, or three hundred ells in stature. A Targum of this kind may explain the fact that the *Acts of John*, (*a*) transferring the "*uncovered*" to Christ, describes Him as "*naked*" *during the Transfiguration*, and also, (*b*) applying it to a disciple, mentions John as peeping out *from under his cloak* (i.e. with "head uncovered") so as to see the mysterious angel at "Gennesaret" (877). Again, (*c*) a misunderstanding of the New Hebrew "stature" may explain the Pseudo-Johannine statement that in the Transfiguration Christ's head (§ 4) "reached to the heaven."

expected] from 'the Lord' [that is, as I have explained] the Spirit." By "*metamorphose*" he means—what the word most naturally would mean—*complete change of essential form, a spiritual change*, as is seen from the only other instance of its use in N.T. (Rom. xii. 1) "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God....And be not *conformed-in-outward-fashion* with this world, but be ye *transformed* (lit. *metamorphosed*) *by the new-creation of the mind*, to the intent that ye may test-and-know what is the Will of God, the Good, the Approved, the Perfect." Here *an inward and complete change of heart and nature* is called "*metamorphosis*", and it is contrasted with an outward and transient change of non-essential qualities.

[884] From this it appears that St Paul would not accept the statement that Christ was "*metamorphosed*", *except as a popular way of stating that the disciples were metamorphosed, "with unveiled face, from glory to glory" by "mirroring the glory" of their Lord.* Similarly we speak of the *sun* as "going down" in the west when we really mean that *we* are "going down" in the east. And similarly Origen—implying that Christ's face is always shining as the sun, if only we did not hide it from ourselves by sending up the vapours and fogs of sin—says "When He is metamorphosed, His face also shines as the sun, that *He may be manifested to the children of light who have put off the works of darkness*[1]." Similarly says the ancient hymn in the Epistle to the Ephesians, "*Awake* thou that sleepest and arise from the dead *and Christ shall shine upon thee*," and perhaps this meaning may be latent under the apparently conflated tradition preserved by Luke alone, that the Apostles "saw his glory when they *were fully awake*[2]," i.e.

[1] *Comm. Matt.* lib. xii. ch. 37 (Huet p. 297).

[2] [**884** *a*] "*Fully awake*". So R.V. text, but marg. "*having remained awake*". Διαγρηγορῶ does not occur in the Gk Test. except here. L.S.

when the eyes of their understanding were fully opened. Peter needed to "awake", as an act of his own will, instigated and aided by the Saviour, and then the "full awaking" and the manifestation of glory followed as the shining of light upon the eyes now opened[1].

give only one instance of it. There it means "*keep awake*", which meaning would also accord with the N.T. use of γρηγορῶ, "watch". But the meaning here is obscure and doubtful: Diatess. has "*with effort they roused themselves*," SS "when they awoke"; and we have seen above (**877**) that a tradition quoted by Clem. Alex. appears to assume "sleeping" in the context, but in quite a different sense, *the sleep of death.* Delitzsch renders by יקץ, which (Levy iv. 300 *a*) means "*watch*", but also causatively "*arouse*", "*awake*". The Hebrew Original, therefore, might be ambiguous. It might mean that the disciples "*were awakened*" by Jesus, or that they "*kept awake*". The latter would naturally be preferred by an evangelist desiring to emphasize his view that the event was not a phantasm but a reality.

[1] [**884** *b*] It may be added that (besides Origen's above-quoted "the three became one") Tertullian and Epiphanius, indicating that Jesus included Moses and Elijah in His glory, unconsciously suggest an Original Tradition that the Apostles received a revelation of the Lawgiver and the Prophet *in Him.* Thus Epiphanius says (*Adv. Haer.* lib. i. tom. 3, p. 328) "He *brought* both of them *with Himself in His own* (ἰδίᾳ) *glory*," "If they had been alien to Him He would not have *revealed them with Himself in His own glory* (leg. αὐτούς for αὐτοῖς)." Tertullian also, without actually employing the phrase "in His own glory," repeatedly implies it, *e.g.* (Marc. iv. 22) "associated *in glory with Him*," "*share His glory*". If, he says, Christ had regarded them (with Marcion) as opponents, they would have been exhibited in mourning garb, the sign of being cast down; but "This is His way of casting them down! He *builds them up out of His own rays* (sic destruit quos de radiis suis exstruit)!" Most striking of all is the obscure passage "Petrus merito contubernium Christi sui agnoscens [? in] individuitate ejus," which appears to mean that in the unity of one Personality Peter recognized a joint tabernacling of the Law, the Prophets, and the Messiah.

[**884** *c*] Tertullian also acutely suggests that Peter could not have recognized Moses and Elijah *by sight*, as the Jewish Law *forbade their* "*images, statues, or likenesses*," and therefore he must have been forced by the Spirit to say what he said, without knowledge, being "out of his mind (amentia)." Some might meet this objection by saying that Moses emitted "horns" and that Elijah was in his "chariot"; others by supposing that their personality was revealed by their conversation with Christ: but there are difficulties in either hypothesis.

§ 5. *Conflict of opinions as to Lk. ix. 33 "Not knowing what he was saying"*

[885] The authenticity of Peter's utterance about the Three Tabernacles will be confirmed if we can find evidence that, from the first century to the fourth, either it was avoided as difficult, or comment was made on it in quite opposite directions.

Mark's comment is (ix. 6) "*He did not know what to answer*, for they became sore afraid[1]."

Matthew omits all comment.

Luke has (ix. 33) "*Not knowing what he was saying.*"

[886] Irenaeus, defending Peter against heretics (presumably including Marcionites) who alleged that only Paul knew the truth, says, "*How could Peter have been in ignorance,* to whom the Lord gave testimony that flesh and blood had not revealed to him but the Father who is in heaven[2]?" The context does not mention the passage under discussion, which Irenaeus nowhere quotes. But it shews how the phrase "*not knowing what he said*" might be turned against Peter in any discussion; as for example in Macarius, where the Christian

[1] [885 *a*] "Sore afraid", ἔκφοβοι. The word occurs in canon. LXX nowhere but in Deut. ix. 19 (where Moses describes his fear on descending from Mount Sinai) and in N.T. nowhere except in Heb. xii. 21 quoting the words of Moses in Deut. ix. 19. This affords strong presumption for supposing that Mark had in mind Moses on the Mount. In the narrative of Exodus, the "fear" of Moses is followed, though not immediately, by a revelation of God's "goodness" (Exod. xxxiii. 19).

Mark (ix. 6) places the "fear" before the Voice, Matthew (xvii. 6) after it. Luke (ix. 34) represents the "fear" as caused by entrance into a cloud, after Peter's utterance, but before the Voice.

[885 *b*] The *Acts of John* (§ 5) represents Peter and James as asking John *who it was that was talking* with the Lord. The writer may possibly have read Mk ix. 6 as οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τίς (for τί) ἀπεκρίθη, "for he [Peter] did not know *who answered.*"

[2] Iren. iii. 13. 2.

Apologist himself, quoting the Apostle's words (Mt. xiv. 28) "If it be thou," censures him thus (p. 88) "*Thou knowest not what thou sayest:* thou speakest as one talking in a dream."

[887] Ephrem Syrus grapples with the difficulty thus, (p. 155) "Simon, in his *want of knowledge*, shews great *knowledge* in his words. For he recognized Moses and Elijah, as also John [the Baptist] *through the Spirit* recognized the Lord coming to him—[through the Spirit I say, and not through knowledge of his own] because he testified (Jn i. 31) '*And I knew him not.*' If therefore *the Spirit* gave a revelation to them, *the Spirit itself spake through Simon's mouth what Simon knew not.*"

[888] Tertullian[1] makes evident what we might have inferred from Irenaeus above, that Marcion used Luke's words against Peter: "But [you say] '*he knew not what he said.*' How, '*knew not*'? Was his ignorance the result of simple error? Or was it on the principle...that to grace ecstasy, or rapture (amentia), is incident. For when a man is rapt in the Spirit, especially *when he beholds the glory of God, or when God speaks through him,* he necessarily loses his sensation." Tertullian, however, does not touch on the question whether equality of rank between Christ, Moses, and Elijah, is implied by Peter in his proposal to erect a tabernacle for each of them.

[889] Clement of Alexandria and Origen might be expected to be in general agreement, and it would be interesting to compare their opinions on this point. But, although the former quotes from Theodotus at considerable length on the Transfiguration, he is silent himself. The general tendency of his thought,—combined with such sayings as these, that Moses (690—691) "raising one Temple to God, announced that the world was only-begotten and that God is one," and "The Word prohibits the constructing of temples"—though

[1] *Marc.* iv. 22.

not incompatible with a fair interpretation of Peter's "three tabernacles", nevertheless suggests that he disliked the expression, or deemed it an utterance of rudimentary revelation. But Origen—while admitting that his view will offend many—says that *Peter spoke under the influence of an evil spirit*, the same that "is called a 'stumbling block' by Jesus, and spoken of as 'Satan'." It was Satan, he thinks, who "promised also to build three tabernacles, one apart for Jesus, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah, as if one tabernacle would not have sufficed for the three...not desiring that Jesus and Moses and Elijah should be together, but desiring to separate them from one another under pretext of the three tabernacles. And likewise it was a lie 'It is good for us to be here.' For, if it had been a good thing, they would also have remained there[1]."

[890] Chrysostom, while not admitting the suggestion of an evil spirit, thinks that fear for his Master, and other good or pardonable motives, accounted for Peter's utterance; but he unhesitatingly condemns it: "What sayest thou, Peter? Didst thou not a little while ago distinguish Him from the servants [of God, *i.e.* the prophets (Mt. xvi. 16)]? Dost thou again reckon Him with the servants?" And then he meets the objection that Peter could not have been ignorant of the superiority of Christ, because he had recently received a revelation from the Father in heaven, by saying, "For even though the Father gave him a revelation, yet he did not continuously hold it fast[2]."

§ 6. *The "three tabernacles"*

[891] Assuming (868) that the utterance of Peter about building "three tabernacles" is historical, we seem driven by John's omission of it to one of two conclusions: either

[1] *Comm. Matth.* lib. xii. ch. 40.

[2] Chrys. *Comm. in Matth.* ed. Field, vol. ii. p. 140.

that John was in error as to facts, or that he omitted a fact, knowing it to be true, because it was unsuitable for his purpose. But may not this be one of the undoubtedly numerous instances where John conveys, in entirely different words, the substance (corrected) of some tradition found in one or more of the Synoptic Gospels? This is all the more worthy of consideration because his intervention is especially discernible at this crisis in our Lord's history, that is to say, the Confession of Peter[1].

[892] Let us suppose, then, that John had before him the saying about the three tabernacles to be built for Christ, Moses, and Elijah, and that he desired to give its spirit and substance in a form intelligible to Gentiles, and detached from a narrative about apparitions of Moses and Elijah, which he regarded as erroneous. All agree that Moses and Elijah typify the Law and the Prophets, *i.e.* the Scriptures.

---

[1] [891 *a*] For instances of Jn supporting Mk against Lk. see *Enc.* GOSPELS, §§ 8—15. Further, as regards Mt. xvi. 18 "Thou art Peter", Jn does not contradict Mt., but he gives quite a different account of the naming, placing it much earlier (Jn i. 42) "Thou shalt be called *Cephas*" (a name preserved by him, alone of the Evangelists). Again, as regards (Mk viii. 33, Mt. xvi. 23) "Get thee *behind* me, *Satan*" (applied to Peter), (Lk. xxii. 31) "Simon, Simon, *Satan* hath *obtained* you," (Jn vi. 70) "*One* of you is a *devil*" (applied not to *Simon*, but to "a *son of Simon*"), it will be shewn in a separate treatise that there may have been some confusion between a tradition mentioning "Satan" in connection with a Hebrew word variously read as אחר, "behind", אחד, "one", and אחז "obtain".

[891 *b*] Lastly, confusion may have arisen from Gk corruption. Jn represents the disciples of Jesus as deserting Him in large numbers shortly before Peter's confession. The expression for "desert" is a Graeco-Hebraic one (vi. 66) "go *backward* (or, *behind*)," *i.e.* fall away. In another form, "go *after* (or, *behind*)" in O.T. frequently means the "following" of false gods instead of Jehovah; and it might be applied by Christians to anyone that, like Demas, "falls away" from his calling, or "goes after the Prince of this World," *i.e.* Satan. Jn says that, during this desertion, Jesus said to Peter (vi. 67) "Will ye also depart?" This might well be expressed, in the *singular*, "Art thou *going after Satan*?" ΥΠΑΓΕΙCΟΠΙCΩCΑΤΑΝΑ. But the same letters (read as *υπαγε ις* (a form of *εις*) *οπισω Σατανα*) are capable of meaning "*Go back, Satan*".

But the Scriptures would naturally be called by any Jew "the words of life," and John himself represents Jesus as saying to the Jews (v. 39) "In them, *i.e.* in the Scriptures, ye think ye have *eternal life*." Hence, whatever may have been Peter's exact meaning—whether he meant that Jesus *included* the Law and the Prophets, or that He *brought a new revelation beyond* the Law and the Prophets—in any case his metaphor, when reduced to prose, could not mean less than this, "Thy words are on a level with those of the Law, concerning which it is said (Deut. xxxii. 47) *It is your life*"[1]; and this would be well expressed by the paraphrase assigned to Peter in the Fourth Gospel (vi. 68) "Lord, to whom shall we go? *Thou hast words of eternal life*."

[**893**] We have now to consider whether there may be any connection between Peter's utterance about "the three tabernacles" and the rest of the Johannine version of the Confession, which continues thus (vi. 69) "And we firmly believe and know that thou art *the Holy One of God*." "The Holy One of God," or "Saint of God", is an appellation that occurs (**812** *c*) only once in the Bible in the form "Saint of the Lord," and it is there applied to Aaron (Ps. cvi. 16) "Moses... and Aaron *the Saint of the Lord*." It is, therefore, a term that would naturally be applied to a Priest. Now returning to Peter's saying, may we not paraphrase it—or at least may we not believe that Christians in early times may have paraphrased it—as meaning "We will build one tabernacle for Moses *the Lawgiver*, and one for Elijah *the Prophet*, and one for thee *the Priest*[2]"?

[1] Comp. Aboth v. 32 "Turn it (the Law) over and turn it over; for the all is therein and thy all is therein; and swerve not therefrom, for thou canst have no greater good than this."

[2] [**893** *a*] Christians would add in later times (as we know from Heb. v. 6 foll.) "Not after the order of Levi, but after the order of Melchizedek, through whose Highpriesthood we have access to the Holy of Holies." Jewish tradition regards the Priesthood as transferred from Melchizedek to Abraham (*Enc. Bibl.* 3016). But this might not prevent

[894] If this interpretation of "Holy One" is reasonable, it seems to harmonize, not only with the Petrine saying about Moses and Elijah, but also with what might be anticipated from the Apostle to whom came the first revelation of Christ's true nature. In the Fourth Gospel, the Lord is not revealed to Peter as "Messiah" or "Christ"—a comparatively conventional term used long before (Jn i. 41, iv. 29) by Andrew and the woman of Samaria, without any suggestion of revelation—but as One who is necessary for the life of His disciples, One about whom they are not prepared to argue and demonstrate, because their "firm belief" and "knowledge" is not and could not be based on argument or on demonstration but on personal conviction of holiness. True, the revelation is probably regarded by John as a rudimentary one: Peter does not acknowledge Jesus as being "*the Word* of life," but as having "*words*" (less likely "the words") "of life." Moreover, even the high title of "the Holy One of God" would apparently not be regarded by John as so high as "the Righteous One of God[1]," still less as equal to "the Only Begotten of God." Still, Peter's insight appears to be placed by the Evangelist above that which prompted Andrew to say to Peter, in the old days by the Jordan, "We have found the Christ." And "Holy One" is antecedently more probable than the Synoptic versions of Peter's Confession, all of which differ from one another, but agree in using the conventional term "Christ". This last term, we may reasonably believe, was not used[2] by Peter in that crisis in which he received his revelation.

Jews from associating the Messiah, as being Abraham's descendant, with that Highpriesthood. Compare what is said about the future Highpriest (mentioned in Ezra ii. 63) j. Kiddousch. iv. 1 (Schwab ix. 277) "Ces mots n'expriment qu'une espérance, comme on dit parfois: jusqu'à la résurrection des morts, ou: jusqu'à la venue du Messie, fils de David."

[1] [894 *a*] Comp. Jn xvii. 11—25 "*Holy* Father...O *righteous* Father," where climax seems to be intended.

[2] See above, **790**.

[895] We conclude that although John appears to have rejected the account of the Transfiguration as unhistorical, it by no means follows that he rejected the striking utterance about the "three tabernacles". If, however, he had set it down literally, with the names of Moses and Elijah, he would have been bound either to describe their presence in the Synoptic terms, or else, by his silence, to convey a flat contradiction of the Synoptic story. This latter step he might not be prepared to take. He might not feel sure that he knew all the facts. Moreover, such contradiction was not in accordance with his system. His plan was to convey to his readers what he knew to be spiritually true without contradicting what he thought to be historically false: and there is good ground for believing that the spiritual truth of Peter's ecstatic exclamation is expressed in the saying "Thou hast words of Eternal Life."

§ 7. *The Transfiguration compared with the Mosaic Theophany* (*Exod. xxxiii.* 23)

[896] Irenaeus and Tertullian see in the Transfiguration, and in the presence of Moses on the Mountain, a fulfilment of a promise made to the latter in Exodus (xxxiii. 23) "Thou shalt see my *back* (Tertullian, *posteriora*)," which they interpret as meaning the glory that was to be revealed "*in later times* (*posterioribus temporibus*)[1]." The *Acts of John*, though it does not mention Moses, mentions the Apostle John as seeing, in the Transfiguration, the "*back parts*" of Jesus, and this must be ultimately traceable to the Mosaic Theophany. It has also been already noted that the same rare word—occurring

[1] [896 *a*] Tertull. *Marc.* iv. 22. Iren. iv. 20. 9 "novissimis temporibus". Origen on Mt. xvi. 28 (Huet p. 292) merely says that the "standing" of the disciples on the Mount was akin to that in Deut. x. 10 "And I *stood* on the mountain forty days and forty nights." Heb. עמד "stand".

but once in LXX and once in the Gospels[1]—is used to characterize the "*extreme-fear*" of Moses at Sinai and of the Apostles at the Transfiguration. Moreover, there is a fair probability (**420**) that Mark's word "*metamorphose*" is an attempt to render the LXX "*put out horns*", applied to the countenance of Moses when it shone with the reflected glory of God[2], after he had descended from the Mount.

[1] [**896** *b*] Ἔκφοβος Mk ix. 6. It occurs also in Heb. xii. 21, but that is a quotation from Deut. ix. 19. See above **885** *a*.

[2] [**896** *c*] The variations of Mk-Mt. and Lk. in the words describing the Metamorphosis of Christ may be illustrated by the Targums describing the Metamorphosis of Moses in Exodus (xxxiv. 29).

(1) Heb. "That (כי) *there-became-horned* (קרן) the skin of his face."

(2) Onk. "How great was *the splendour of* (זיו) *the glory of* (יקרא) his countenance."

(3) Jer. I. "That the *visage* (*form*) of his face *shone with the splendour that had come upon him from the brightness of the glory of the Lord's Shekinah.*"

(4) Jer. II. "That the *beams* of his face did *shine.*"

(5) LXX "That *there-was-glorified the aspect* of *the colour* of his face."

Possibly Onkelos read כי קרן as כיקר "like glory", and based his amplification on this error.

The word used by Onkelos "splendour" (זיו) occurs in Dan. iv. 36 "mine honour and my *brightness*," LXX (?) δόξα, Theod. μορφή, v. 6 "His *countenance* (marg. *brightness*) was changed," LXX ὅρασις, Theod. μορφή, vii. 28 *ib.* LXX ἕξις, Theod. μορφή.

[**896** *d*] From this, it appears that "*metamorphose*" might represent some Hebrew phrase containing the word "*splendour*" or "*glory*". But, whatever may have been its origin, it was a most unfortunate word (from the Greek point of view) to apply to Christ: for He could not change His "*essential-form*", μορφή, though He might change His "transitory form" or "fashion" (Philipp. ii. 7, σχήματι). His "*form*" was that of a Son, and also (Philipp. ii. 7) that of a Servant of servants, which He may be believed to have been from the beginning. His "*fashion*" was the figure of a man, a merely temporary arrangement. An excuse might be suggested for "*metamorphose*", namely, that it may mean "exhibit a form quite new and startling to the beholders": but we cannot be surprised that Luke altered it. The Mark-Appendix (xvi. 12 "in another *form*") commits the same error. Possibly Mark felt (Lightf. Philipp. pp. 130–1) "that in the account of the transfiguration, μετασχηματίζεσθαι would have been out of place": but there were other alternatives besides the heathenish "*metamorphose*".

[897] Collectively, the facts afford good reason for thinking that the author of Mark's Original had the Mosaic Theophany in his mind when he wrote of Christ's Transfiguration; and this is all the more likely if—as is maintained on good grounds—the *Assumption of Moses* was current in the writer's time[1]. For, in a quotation from that work, Clement of Alexandria describes Moses as being *seen in two forms* by Joshua, but in only one by Caleb: (806–7) "*Moses in his assumption was seen by Joshua in two forms:* in one, accompanied by angels; in the other, on the mountains, in the act of being buried in their rocky recesses. Now this sight was seen by Joshua below, being lifted up in the Spirit, along with Caleb also. The two however did not behold it alike. But the one descended with greater speed, as if the weight he carried was great; while the other, on descending after him, afterwards related the glory which he beheld, being able to perceive more than the other, as having grown purer."

[898] And this leads us to the greatest of all the difficulties probably presented to the author of the Fourth Gospel by the story of the Transfiguration in the Three—namely, that, on the surface at all events, it would seem to him to compare unfavourably with the Mosaic Theophany.

Let us compare the circumstances of the two revelations or theophanies. Moses, before ascending the Mount, stands forth as a Mediator willing to lay down his life for his people: (Exod. xxxii. 31) "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin... Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin— : and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." The

[1] [897 *a*] "The Assumption of Moses was, in all probability, a composite work....., the Testament of Moses, and the Assumption. The former was written in Hebrew, between 7 and 29 A.D., and possibly also the latter. A Greek version of the entire work appeared in the first century A.D. Of this a few phrases and sentences have been preserved in St Matt. xxiv. 29, Acts vii. 35, St Jude 9, 16, 18 (?), the Apocalypse of Baruch, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other Greek writers," ed. Charles, p. xiii.

Lord replies that He will not go with Israel but will send an angel as substitute: but the Mediator pleads for God's own presence. When he has obtained this petition, he urges another, (Exod. xxxiii. 18) "Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory." To this the first answer is, "I will make all my GOODNESS pass before thee...." Then comes a second, "Thou canst not see my FACE: for man shall not see me and live"; then a third, "There is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock; and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand until I have passed by; and I will take away mine hand and thou shalt see my BACK: but my FACE shall not be seen."

[899] The LXX completely changes the sense of this remarkable passage by giving the first words thus, "Shew me *thyself*. And he said, I will go before thee in my *glory*"—substituting "*self*" for "*glory*", and "*glory*" for "*goodness*". The Hebrew appears to mean just the opposite. Moses, it is true, had asked for a revelation of God's "*glory*"; but God, in His wisdom, bestows a revelation of His "*goodness*". The "*glory*", being as it were in the front of all the divine attributes for man's imperfect vision, is here called the "*face*"; the "goodness", being in the back-ground (for human vision), is here called the "*back*".

[900] Of course, as a rule, the "*face*" of God is regarded as the source of light and life for His creatures: but here, owing to its antithesis with "*back*", it may have a special meaning. In the preceding context (Exod. xxxiii. 14) "My *face* shall go," "*face*" is explained, in the Babylonian Talmud, by R. Jochanan on the authority of R. Jose (A.D. 130—60), as meaning "aspect of *wrath*", so that the words convey a promise to Moses, "*My wrath* shall pass away"; and the same explanation is repeated in the Talmud later on[1]. This

[1] [900 *a*] Berach. 7[a]. The same explanation is more briefly expressed (*ib.* 7[b]) by R. Jochanan on the authority of R. Simon ben Jochai (A.D. 130–60).

view of "*glory*" or "*face*" is not contradicted by the Jerusalem Targums (I and II on Exod. xxxiii. 22—23) which paraphrase the "*glory*" as "*hosts of angels*": for, according to Jewish belief, angels—like winds and lightnings, the ministers of God—are often the destructive agents of God's wrath[1].

[**901**] According to this view, what is here called God's "*glory*", or "*face*", is what Cowper, in a different metaphor, calls God's "frowning providence"; and what the Hebrew calls His "back", because it is in the back-ground, is called by the English hymn the "smiling face", hidden behind the cloud. Certainly R. Jochanan's explanation gives a noble and consistent view of the Mosaic Theophany: Moses, it implies, cannot see God's "*face*", *as conceived by man*; for the sight would destroy him. Therefore he is to be covered with the divine hand until *that transient and destructive aspect of wrath, which man calls "glory"*, has passed by. Then the hand shall be removed that he may see what is, for man, the BACK of God, that is, the highest revelation, the one that is both best and furthest off, His GOODNESS[2].

---

[1] See Hershon Genes. Talm. pp. 61 and 383, Schöttg. ii. 475, and Levy iii. 121 *b* for traditions that angels are sometimes jealous of men, or hostile to them.

[2] [**901** *a*] The "back" of God has been variously interpreted. Philo (i. 258 ὅσα μετὰ τὸν θεόν, i. 579 μετὰ τὸ ὄν) regards the phrase as meaning secondary causes as distinct from the First: so apparently Onkelos, "that which is *after me*": Irenaeus and Tertullian, "that which is to be revealed *in after-time*": Jerusalem Targ. (I) "thou shalt see *the hand-border of the tephilla of my glorious Shekinah*": Jerusalem Targ. (II) "I will make known *the oracle*": Bab. Talm. Berach. 7ª (Schwab i. p. 247) "God shewed to Moses *the construction of the knot of the phylacteries*."

[**901** *b*] The *Acts of John* says (§ 4) "And I stood gazing on Him towards His *hinder parts* (τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ). And I saw Him clothed in *no garments at all, but stripped of these*...and His *feet* whiter than fuller's soap [or] *snow* [could make them]." Here "*snow*" may be a conflation of "*fuller's soap*", as it is a substitute for "*fuller*" in Mk ix. 3 (D, SS). Or it may be explained by Job ix. 30 "wash myself with *snow* and cleanse my hands with *lye*."

[**901** *c*] The writer seems to have followed a Hebrew tradition that

[902] In this Theophany we see a clear connection between cause and effect. Moses, the Lawgiver, who ought to have known God's justice better, wrongly supposed, though but for a moment, that the righteous Judge of all the earth could blot a righteous man out of the Book of Life to save an unrighteous nation. It was an error, but at least an unselfish and magnanimous one, superior to many millions of merits of ordinary men: and hence it was rewarded by a revelation, and precisely the one needed by a soul that had been disposed to magnify God's power or "glory" above His "goodness".

[903] Again, Elijah the Prophet and restorer of God's altar had wrongly dreamed that force and the sword could re-establish the pure worship of God in the hearts of a backsliding people; and thus, succumbing to the deceptions of visible things, he had come to suppose that he himself was the sole pillar of Israel, indispensable to Jehovah—erring, like Moses, but, like Moses, erring with a sublime and passionate unselfishness, swept away by his exceeding zeal for the Lord of hosts. Hence he, too, received an appropriate vision in which he saw the loud, violent, and destructive forces of nature passing as it were across the stage, each by itself, alone—each unmasked in its natural weakness, weak because alone, that is to say, because void of God and fulfilling

---

conflated various renderings of "*hinder parts*". The Greek word (ὀπίσθια) is used in Jeremiah (xiii. 22) to mean "*skirts*" or "*train*"; and "His *skirts*" (Is. vi. 1) means the "*train*" (LXX "glory") of Jehovah. The Jerusalem Targum (I) and Bab. Talm., quoted above, seem to have interpreted somewhat similarly "the *back*" in Exodus. The *Acts of John* appears to protest, negatively as well as positively, against this interpretation of "*hinder parts*". First, it says that there were *no* "*garments*" to hide the revealed splendour. Then, as though the writer may have had the word שול before him and wished to adopt any rendering of it except "garments", he perhaps corruptly conflated it as "*feet*" and "*stripped*"; at all events it is rendered "*feet*" in Lam. i. 9, and the similar שולל (Kri) is rendered (Mic. i. 8) "*stripped*", LXX ἀνυπόδετος.

no divine decree—a negative revelation that prepared him to receive the positive one, that of the "still small voice".

[904] What can we say, like this, in favour of the Transfiguration as told by the Synoptists? In the first place, what did it reveal to the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John, that they did not know before? It may be replied, "The stupendous revelation conveyed in the Voice from Heaven—'*This is my beloved Son.*'" But had not these words been uttered already (according to the Synoptists) at the Baptism of Jesus, and presumably in the hearing of John the Baptist? And had not John the Apostle been one of the Baptist's "two disciples" who (according to the Fourth Gospel) heard their teacher say (Jn i. 36) "Behold, the Lamb of God" and then "followed Jesus"? And is it conceivable that this pupil should thus be transferred, as it were, from the Prophet to the Messiah, without being informed by the Prophet of these supernatural words from heaven? But if he had been informed of them *then*, there was nothing new in them *now*. What John the son of Zebedee had heard before from the Baptist as coming from heaven, he now heard, coming from the same source, with his own ears; but it was the same revelation, or rather not now a revelation, but a reiteration of what had been before revealed.

[905] Again, Peter had already called Jesus (according to Matthew) "the Christ, the Son of the living God," or (according to Mark and Luke) "the Christ", or "the Christ of God." Had not this been a *revelation* to Peter? Matthew distinctly says, in the person of Jesus, that it had been: "Flesh and blood hath not *revealed* it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Here is proof, then, if not of a Voice from a cloud, at all events of a voice or word from God to Peter conveying what appears to be substantially the same revelation as that which was afterwards conveyed on the mountain.

[906] Thus, by a twofold anticipation, the revelation on

the Holy Mount is made to appear, so far as the mere Voice from the cloud is concerned, little more than a repetition of what had been supernaturally conveyed before by a Word or Voice of God to John the Baptist and to Peter. For it can hardly be maintained that the words "Hear ye him", apart from subtle and ancient associations with Jewish literature, constitute such an addition to the Baptismal Voice as to convert the latter into a new message. "Was it necessary"—we can imagine Celsus asking, or Epictetus, a lover of truth if ever there was one—"to add *Hear ye him*, after the disciples, represented by Peter, had accepted their Master as God's Son?" And then, could we Christians honestly complain if the sceptical Celsus, having perhaps a little knowledge of the two Old Testament theophanies above described, were to proceed somewhat in this strain, "What, then, after all, was revealed in the Metamorphosis of your Messiah? Nothing for certain—that is to say, nothing that is asserted by the three narrators—except that there was a bright light about the garments of Jesus and the forms of Moses and Elijah. For the rest, the two later accounts say that the face of Jesus was also changed or illuminated; but the earliest does not. And only the latest of the three tells us what Moses and Elijah said. The earliest writers bring the Lawgiver and the Prophet on the stage as mutes at a funeral! Strangest of all, only Luke tells us that Jesus was praying at the time of the Metamorphosis, and even Luke does not give us any notion of the tenor of the prayer. How spiritually meagre is all this, and how commonplace and vulgar Luke's conception of 'glory' as compared with the two ancient Hebrew records of the theophanies vouchsafed on Mount Sinai to Moses and Elijah!"

[**907**] These considerations together with those brought forward in the previous section of this chapter sufficiently explain why John may have omitted the Transfiguration as being an inadequate account of a real spiritual fact—so

inadequate, so misleading, and so variously related by the three Synoptists that he could not, as he did in the story of the Baptism, preserve the foundations and something of the superstructure of the Synoptic narrative, but was forced to reconstruct almost from the beginning. "But why 'reconstruct' at all?"—it may be asked—"Why not simply omit what he knew to be an error?" Because, perhaps, he knew that the error had taken the place of an almost forgotten truth[1]. The unanimous evidence of the Synoptists—so he may have believed—was correct to this extent, that there had been on one occasion a Bath Kol, which had descended upon Jesus in a revelation of "glory"; and, as Luke had testified, it was in answer to the Lord's prayer. But the "glory" was not that of Luke's narrative. It was something entirely different, so different, so alien from the common thaumaturgic conceptions of divine "glory" that he could not hope to make his readers feel it except through a new setting forth of the personality of Jesus. The narrative must be built up by the Evangelist afresh, in a way of his own. Following the old historical traditions so far as they were true, but retaining only their spiritual essence and avoiding the old historical expressions, he must begin by giving his readers a glimpse of the "glory" of the Only-begotten "full of grace and truth." Then he might hope by degrees to prepare them for a fuller vision of "glory", so that they might understand the nature of that prayer in answer to which the Father glorified the Son by a Voice from heaven.

[1] [**907** *a*] *E.g.* Mark's (ix. 3) "fuller" (**864** *b*) seems to be a survival of a spiritual doctrine (omitted or obscured by Mt.-Lk.), that the Messiah revealed His (Dan. vii. 9) "*white garments*", for His disciples' sake, (Dan. xi. 35) "to refine them and to purify and *to make them white*." Comp. (1 Jn iii. 2—3) "We shall *see him as he is*. And every one that hath this hope [set] on him *purifieth himself even as he is pure*."

BOOK V

THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN
AN ANSWER TO PRAYER

CHAPTER I

"TROUBLE" PRECEDING PRAYER

§ 1. *The object of investigation*

[908] If the only remaining question were, "Does the Johannine Voice from Heaven differ from the Synoptic Voices in having an objective and historical character?" our investigations might almost immediately close. Objective it was not, as we know from John's own statement that some regarded it as "thunder" and others as the voice of "an angel". And that it was not historical may be inferred in two ways. First, had it been so, it could not well have been omitted by the three Synoptists. They might misunderstand and corrupt it, but they would not be likely to pass over a historical Bath Kol in the life of the Messiah, while inserting two that are not historical. Secondly, internal evidence may be brought to shew that the whole of this part of the Johannine narrative is based upon traditions which, though sound so far as regards their general and spiritual purport, are unsound in historical detail.

[909] "Why not stop here, then?"—it may be asked, "Of what use can it be to ascertain the origin of a tradition about a confessedly subjective Voice from Heaven, of which the words can be shewn to have sprung from some misunderstanding?" The answer is this. John represents the Voice

as an answer to prayer, and to prayer drawn forth from Christ by trouble: and, apart from the Last Discourse, this is the only prayer uttered by Christ in the whole of the Fourth Gospel. In the Synoptic Gospels also there is only one occasion in which the Three agree in describing Christ as praying, and this too is a time of trouble: but in their record of His prayer, they differ greatly among themselves, and all of them differ from John. An attempt will be made to shew that the Revisers have mistranslated Mark and not adequately translated John; and that John's version, adequately rendered, is probably the best approximation to the spirit of Christ's actual words.

[**910**] But further, a part of the Synoptic version of Christ's utterance on this unique occasion ("thy will be done") has been incorporated by Matthew in what is called the Lord's Prayer. Luke, however, omits these words in his form of the Lord's Prayer; and it will be shewn not only that he is probably right in omitting them, but also that, in the narrative of Gethsemane, they should be regarded as not exactly expressing what our Lord really said.

[**911**] Lastly, as regards the "trouble" that called forth the prayer, and as to which Luke deviates altogether from the two earlier Synoptists, it will be contended that John—as often in the case of Luke's deviations—steps in to explain the substance of the earlier Gospels, shewing that the "trouble" was of a much higher and nobler nature than might be inferred from the study of Mark; and it will be shewn that John is probably right and that Mark may have given a wrong impression by mistranslating a Hebrew original.

[**912**] No one will deny that the results to be attained—if indeed they can be attained—are at all events worth attaining. They do not turn on questions of mere locality—as, for example, whether the place of this great crisis in our Lord's life was Hermon, or Tabor, or the Mount of Olives, or Gethsemane, or the Mountain of the Lord's House *i.e.* the

Temple: nor shall we trouble ourselves much whether the "Greeks" who come to Christ in the Fourth Gospel are identical with the "children" who sing Hosanna to Him in the Second Gospel (Matthew), or with the "lame and the blind" whom the same Evangelist describes as coming to Christ in the sacred building although, according to the Mishna, they were not included in the obligation to attend the Feasts[1]; nor will the "angel" that John mentions as (according to some) answering Christ's prayer, and the angel mentioned in a doubtful passage of Luke as "strengthening" Christ while He was praying, detain us long in the discussion of their possible identity. These questions are all highly interesting; but their interest is as nothing compared with the fascination of the possibility of a somewhat closer approach to a true conception of what Christ said and felt on the two occasions—which possibly ought to be called one occasion—on which the Synoptists and John severally record words of prayer proceeding from His lips.

§ 2. *The Johannine Voice from Heaven*

[**913**] The words of the Johannine Bath Kol are simply (xii. 28) "I [have] both glorified and will again glorify." They are obviously—and any one who has made a careful study of the Gospel and First Epistle will add that they are deliberately[2]—incomplete. The reader is intended to be

[1] [**912** *a*] B. Chag. ch. i. (Rodkinson, vol. vi. Chag. p. 1) "Mishna; All are bound in the case of a holocaust except a deaf man, a fool, a minor... and women, and bondsmen, *the lame*, *the blind*, the sick, the old...." "Holocaust" is said by the translator to = ראיה "appearing" (see Deut. xvi. 16). Goldschmidt has not yet edited Chag.

[2] [**913** *a*] Westcott's notes on the Gospel and Epistle contain abundant testimony to the careful and subtle arrangements and distinctions that underlie John's apparent simplicity of style, *e.g.* his distinction between ἀγαπῶ and φιλῶ in Jn xxi. 15—17. As regards pronouns, John generally uses them profusely. Few or no instances of omission could be alleged from the Gospel and Epistle parallel to the one under discussion.

thrown back upon the context and to ask "Glorify *what*?" The "*what*" is explained by Christ's prayer—on which the Bath Kol depends for its sense—"Father, glorify *thy name*." These words are pregnant with a multitude of meanings—which, however, must not detain us here except so far as a glance at the prayer may be needful to understand the Bath Kol. Exodus has told us (**820**) that God's NAME is in the Messenger whom He sends ("my NAME is in him"). He cannot therefore glorify His NAME without glorifying the Messenger. But the Messenger, being the Son, could not possibly put Himself before the Father, as He would have done had He said "Glorify me": He therefore begins by saying "Glorify thy *Name*", with the result that, later on, He says (xvii. 1) "Glorify thy *Son*". The result is in accordance with a fundamental saying of the Bible, "*Them that glorify me I will glorify*," which is accepted by Ben Zoma in the Sayings of the Jewish Fathers as meaning "Them that glorify *man made in the image of God*, God will glorify as though they had glorified Him[1]." This is a far-reaching interpretation—or perhaps we should say substitution of new thoughts for old—which would harmonize the worship of Jehovah with a religion of humanity. A similar thought is at the bottom of the identification of the terms "Son of man" and "Son of God".

[**914**] All the interest here is in the Prayer—not in the Bath Kol, which is a mere echo, meaningless without the Prayer. The Jewish Bath Kol is a voice "coming out of" a

[1] [**913** *b*] See Jewish Prayer Book p. 195, where it is printed as one of four sayings of Ben Zoma (on whom see **687** *a*): "Who is honoured? He that honours mankind; for it is said (1 S. ii. 30) *For them that honour me I will honour....*" In 1 S. ii. 30 R.V. has "them that *honour* me I will *honour*": but the LXX there has "them that *glorify* me I will *glorify* (δοξάσω)," and renders the verb (כבד) more frequently "glorify" than "honour". It is the same word as that used in the commandment "Honour thy father and thy mother," where the LXX has "honour", τιμῶ.

heavenly voice; the Johannine Bath Kol is a voice coming out of a voice that is uttered on earth. But the latter comes from the Son, therefore it comes from heaven: for wherever the Son is, there is the Father, and there is heaven. The Jewish Bath Kol is often a text of Scripture, and the *Horae Hebraicae*, ironically but fairly, describes it as occupied in "applauding the Rabbins": but here God, as it were, seems to "applaud" Himself, though in reality He is accepting from the Son a sacrifice of pain, as Abraham from Isaac, that affects Him as well as His Son. But the main point is the dependence of the Bath Kol on the prayer of the Son. It is little more than a twofold Amen: "It has been so. It shall be so." And the meaning is, "Thou hast been with me from the beginning in the unity of perfect and self-sacrificing love, thou shalt be with me in the same unity for ever."

[**915**] There is no need to say anything about the beauty of this conception, which can perhaps be best felt in silence. The point for discussion is its textual origin, as to which the following suggestion is offered. St Paul says that God bestowed on Jesus "*the name that is above every name.*" This periphrasis does not appear to be used in Hebrew literature[1], and it is probably an attempt to express for Philippian readers what Jews would call "the NAME" or sometimes "the glorious NAME." If so, there was perhaps an early tradition that God, as Jews might (Ps. xlix. 11) say, "called (**971** (ii)) on Jesus the NAME." Now when Deuteronomy mentions the "*glorious* and fearful name," Onkelos, in substituting New Hebrew terms, inevitably alters the letters in such a way as to make "glorious name" almost identical with "*my* name *will I glorify*[2]." Again the word "call" often so closely resembles

[1] Philipp. ii. 9 *τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα.* Wetstein, Schöttgen, and Bishop Lightfoot allege no parallel to this from any Jewish or Hebrew source.

[2] [**915** *a*] Deut. xxviii. 58 השם הנכבד, lit. "the name the glorified," Onk. שמא יקירא, "name glorious". In the text of Onkelos, by prefixing the final א to the following word, we should have שם איקירא which might

the New Hebrew for "glorious" that it might easily be taken as a reduplication of the latter[1]. Hence might arise a tradition converting "*called* the *glorious* name" into "*glorifying I will glorify* the name," which might be taken by John as meaning "I have glorified my name in the past and will glorify it in the future."

[916] Thus, either out of the Philippian tradition (which somewhat resembles that in the Testament of the Patriarchs, "there shall come upon Him consecration" and "the glory of the Highest shall be uttered upon Him") or else from some variant of those much-varied words above quoted from Exodus, "My NAME is in him," NAME being supplemented by the epithet "glorious", we may easily explain John's insertion, and the Synoptic omission, of this Bath Kol. The Synoptists may have omitted it because in their time it was an apostolic statement of spiritual fact, "Christ received the glorious name"; John may have inserted it because, when he was writing, it had been developed into a Voice from Heaven.

From this comparatively unimportant detail we turn to an investigation of the various evangelic accounts about the feelings that elicited from Christ the unique prayer recorded by them severally.

§ 3. "*Exceeding sorrowful*", "*troubled*"

[917] Mark, Matthew, and John describe the "exceeding sorrow", or "trouble", that preceded our Lord's prayer, as mentioned in His own words thus:

Mk xiv. 34, Mt. xxvi. 38	Jn xii. 27
"*Exceeding-sorrowful* is my soul unto death; abide here and watch (Mt + with me)."	"Now is my soul *troubled*."

easily be taken as שמי אוקיר, "*my name I will glorify*." See Levy *Ch.* i. 343 for New Heb. יקר substituted for Bib. Heb. כבד.

[1] [915 *b*] "Be glorious", יקר, and "call", קרא, are confused by LXX in Prov. xx. 6, Dan. iv. 30 (LXX, but not Theod.), Hos. xi. 7.

W.H. print "exceeding-sorrowful is my soul" as a quotation from the Psalms, where a refrain of this kind is thrice repeated[1]. "My soul is troubled" they print as a quotation either from the same passage, or from an earlier Psalm. There can be little doubt, however, that John is quoting from the same Psalm as the Synoptists, but he deviates from them for the following reasons.

[918] The Psalm says (xlii. 5—6) "Why art thou *cast down*, *O my soul*, and why art thou disquieted upon[2] me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise him for the help of his countenance. O my God, my soul is *cast down* upon[2] me." In the interrogative (as also in two repetitions of the interrogative refrain) the LXX renders "cast down" by "*exceeding-sorrowful*", but in the affirmative by "*troubled*". Now "*exceeding-sorrowful*" occurs in the canonical LXX elsewhere only in the sense of "furious", applied to Cain and Nebuchadnezzar; and though it is used by the Psalmist here thrice about himself, it is always in a *question*, "*Why* art thou cast down?", which question the LXX retains "*Why* art thou *exceeding-sorrowful?*" This "why" implies, as always in Hebrew, a prohibition, "*Be not* cast down[3]." But the Hebrew "*Why?*" means also "*How!*" i.e. "*How greatly!*" so that a translator might mistake what really means "*Be not* in despair" as though it meant "*I am in utter* despair." This

[1] Ps. xlii. 5, 11, xliii. 5.

[2] [918 *a*] "Upon me", so Gesen. 753 *b*, *i.e.* "pressing upon me", "too heavy for me to bear," rendered "from me" in LXX of Ps. cxlii. 3, Jon. ii. 8 &c. It might be paraphrased as "unto death", which Mk-Mt. here have. Or the word "disquieted", תהמר, might be read as המות "death" (comp. Prov. xix. 18, Ezek. vii. 16) and עלי might be confused with עד, "unto" (comp. Exod. xx. 5, 1 K. xv. 20, xvii. 20, 1 Chr. vii. 29, Is. ix. 6, Dan. xi. 10 (LXX)), where על and עד are confused.

[3] [918 *b*] Gesen. 553 *b* quotes a number of passages where מה="why?" in "the transition from the interrog. to the neg. to which in Heb. there is an approx.," Exod. xiv. 15, xvii. 2, 2 K. vi. 33, &c. He quotes none where מה "why?" is used in a question asking for information.

might be paraphrased as "I am exceeding sorrowful *unto death*": or the italicized words might be added by a misunderstanding of the Hebrew context, which happens to lend itself to such an addition (**918***a*). Thus by easy stages an impassioned command to be hopeful and to *put away despair* might be converted into what might be regarded by some as *an avowal of absolute desperation.*

[919] This may explain the omission of the words by Luke—who could hardly have omitted a saying assigned at this point to Christ by the earlier Evangelists without some strong reason. On the other hand, John may have accepted the earlier Synoptic tradition so far as this, that Jesus quoted the Psalmist's refrain forbidding his soul to despair; but he would certainly reject any Synoptic version of it that converted, or might seem to convert, the forbidding into an avowing. These being the circumstances, all would have been clear and plain for us if John had represented Jesus as exactly quoting the LXX, "Why art thou exceeding-sorrowful?" But, had he done this, he would have come into direct collision with Mark and Matthew—which he always avoids as far as possible. Moreover it was hardly consistent with his conception of the Lord that He should, in human fashion, forbid His soul to do this or that by asking it a question.

[920] A third reason requires somewhat ampler statement. We have seen that the LXX renders the Hebrew "cast down" by two words, interrogatively by "exceeding-sorrowful" (sometimes meaning "wrathful" and "furious"), and affirmatively by "troubled". Now this last word happened to hit precisely a fundamental distinction between the Gospel of Christ (as John conceived it) and the doctrine of Epictetus—which was in vogue at the beginning of the second century, and which inculcated on every philosopher *the fundamental duty of preserving "freedom from trouble"*. In opposition to this Stoic dogma, John thrice connects Christ with "trouble"[1].

[1] Jn xi. 33, xii. 27, xiii. 21.

First, he tells us that Jesus "troubled *himself*" for the death of Lazarus and the sorrow of the survivors. Much later, Jesus "was troubled *in spirit*" over the anticipated treachery of Judas. Between these two comes the "trouble" under discussion, a "trouble" of "soul".

[**921**] The cause of this intervening "trouble" appears from the context to be complex. In part it seems to spring from a sorrow over the conditions of imperfect humanity, the Law that death must precede the higher life, and that the grain must die to bring forth fruit. But in part also, and probably in much greater part, it seems to be sorrow over His countrymen, over Israel after the flesh, who manifested their blindness to the Light at the very moment when the Gentiles opened their eyes to it. In less than a dozen verses the contrast is brought out. The Elders of Israel confess that the Messiah is their enemy against whom they "prevail nothing", for "the world is gone after him." At once the "Greeks" come on the stage, saying, "We would see Jesus."

[**922**] A somewhat similar contrast is described by Luke on the occasion of the return of the Seventy, the types of the Apostles of the Gentiles, announcing their success. The Lord is there represented as acknowledging and acquiescing[1] in the inscrutable wisdom of the Father who has revealed to babes what He has hidden from the wise and prudent. There, too, as here in John, mention is made of a great spiritual triumph, of "Satan" cast down "from heaven". But it is not to be supposed that the joy of triumph was untinged by pangs of failure.

---

[1] [**922** *a*] Lk. x. 17—21 "And the seventy returned...And he said unto them, I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven....In that same hour he *rejoiced* [in] the Holy Spirit and said, I thank thee, O Father... that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight."

Instead of "rejoiced [in] the Holy Spirit," Mt. xi. 25 has "answered".

[**923**] John represents almost the last words of Christ to "the multitude" as predicting the uplifting of "the Son of man," and "the multitude" replies, "*Who is this Son of man?*" Could failure be more complete? If Moses, for his countrymen's sake, could pray, "Blot me out of thy book," and St Paul, for the same sake, was fair to wish himself "anathema" from Christ—it is not possible to believe that the Messiah, who included in Himself all that was noblest and most patriotic in Israel, could do otherwise than feel a most bitter "trouble of soul" over the immediate fall of the nation, even though He "hoped still in the Lord" that it would be finally restored[1].

[**924**] For these three reasons, then—and for the third not least—John might not wish to correct Mark's error by simply converting "My soul is exceeding sorrowful" into a question. Moreover, another course was open to him. He had merely to take the neighbouring affirmative clause "my

---

[1] [**923** *a*] There is a striking difference in the way in which Matthew and Luke introduce Christ's words of acquiescence in the rejection of "the wise and prudent":

Mt. xi. 25	Lk. x. 21
"In that season *answered* Jesus and said, I (lit.) confess unto thee, O Father, ..."	"In that same hour *he rejoiced* [*in*] *the Holy Spirit* and said, I (lit.) confess unto thee, O Father, ..."

Compare Hos. ii. 15, ענתה (R.V. txt.) "shall *make answer*", marg. "shall *sing*", LXX "shall be afflicted (*ταπεινωθήσεται*)" and Ezr. iii. 11, "*sang* in praising", LXX "*answered* in praise".

[**923** *b*] The root ענה has the three meanings "answer", "sing", "be afflicted". Possibly the Original was, "He made answer *to the Holy One*, i.e. *to God*...." This may have been taken by Matthew as "*There made answer the Holy One* (Jesus)," i.e. "*Jesus answered*". Luke may have taken it as "*sang in praise to the Holy Spirit*" (not "*in* the Spirit") acquiescing in the revelation that the Spirit had bestowed on Him. In that case the literal translation would be "rejoiced *to* the Holy Spirit."

[**923** *c*] The passage seems to imply a message from heaven, though not a Bath Kol. It should also be noted that the ambiguous verb might give rise to a tradition that Jesus "was *afflicted*" by the message although He at once acquiesced in it.

soul is cast down" and to render "cast down" (as the LXX does in this clause) by the verb "trouble". This gave him the words "My soul is troubled." Thus he adhered to the old tradition—and who shall say that it was not a true one?—that Jesus quoted from the forty-second Psalm; he avoided Mark's erroneous rendering; and yet he could not be said to contradict Mark; for the difference between him and the earlier Evangelist might seem to be no more than this, that, of two contiguous and parallel clauses in the quotation, Mark chose one and John the other. Yet in reality there may be an abyss between the two meanings—if the one is equivalent to "I utterly despair", and the other to "I take upon myself trouble," or "My soul is troubled [in accordance with the will of God]."

§ 4. *John's doctrine of "trouble", truer than that of the Synoptists*

[**925**] Setting aside the description of the Last Supper, we may say that only on one occasion do the Synoptists give us a clear expression of the truth that Christ's life and work and sorrows had a *sacrificial or mediatorial meaning*, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister *and to give his soul a ransom for many*[1]." This saying occurs in Christ's Discourse about True Greatness and Lordship; and the italicized words, in which Matthew and Mark agree verbatim, are essential for the meaning. Luke, however, omits them, and thus leaves it open to his readers to take the whole discourse as teaching a man "the art of becoming great" without any regard to his neighbours except so far as he benefits them for the sake of benefiting himself, as though Christ simply said, "If you would be a prince over your brethren in heaven, make yourself their minister upon earth."

[1] [**925** *a*] Mk x. 45, Mt. xx. 28 (Lk. xxii. 27 "But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth").

[926] What Luke confessedly omits here, the earlier Synoptists may be almost demonstratively shewn to have omitted elsewhere; and if we do not supply the deficiency from the Fourth Gospel, or from what we may derive by inference from the account of the Lord's Supper, we shall be in danger of missing the force of many of Christ's most divine sayings. For example, the words—uttered just before the Transfiguration—"If any man will follow after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me," might mean "Let a man deny himself every pleasure, mortify every desire, reduce himself to the position of a condemned criminal on his way to an ignominious death." And then the inference would be suggested that by thus making oneself supremely miserable in the flesh during this life one may secure supreme happiness in the life to come. But in reality Christ was teaching His disciples how to lose their lives, as He was losing His, by laying it down for the lost sheep. "Losing one's life" did not mean suicide; nor did "taking up the cross" mean self-torture: in both cases He implied—and the implied addition is essential—*for others*.

[927] But it may be urged, "How can you be sure that the Synoptists are not right and John wrong? May not the latter have read into the earliest Christian traditions a high sacrificial meaning, noble indeed and spiritual, but not historical?" The answer is founded on cogent facts connected with Christ's predictions of His Passion. These were almost certainly based upon Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant, who is to "*make intercession* for trangressors." Now in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts there is nowhere any mention of "*making intercession*" for transgressors or sinners; but there is frequent mention of "being *delivered up*" into the hands of "transgressors", "sinners", "Gentiles", "men", "chief priests" &c.; and we find *the LXX actually rendering the Hebrew in Isaiah* (liii. 12), "*made intercession*", *by* "*was delivered up*". To clench the matter, *St Paul actually quotes*

this verse of Isaiah and applies it to Christ in the words of the LXX, "was delivered up"[1]. It only remains to explain that the Hebrew preposition here rendered "*for*" ("make intercession *for*") is regularly rendered "*to*"[2], so that Christian Evangelists adopting "*deliver up*" with the LXX as a rendering of "make intercession", but in other respects following the Hebrew, might naturally give, as the result, "*shall be delivered up to* sinners," interpreting "sinners" either as the sinful sons of men, or as Gentiles (called "sinners" by the Jews), or as the sinful persecutors of Christ (*i.e.* the "chief priests") &c.

[928] It happens that the same Greek word is used in N.T. to describe the Father "delivering up" the Son, or the Son "delivering up" Himself, for the sins of men, and Judas "delivering up", *i.e.* "betraying", Jesus to the Chief Priests[3]. Jesus is said by the Evangelists to have predicted the latter act. Doubtless they are right. But if He also predicted the former, the use of the same word in the two predictions might obviously result in confusing two entirely different things. For example, in St Paul's description of the Last Supper, Pauline usage ought to oblige us to render the words, not (as in R.V.) "on the same night on which he was *betrayed*,"

[1] [927 *a*] Rom. iv. 25. Comp. Rom. viii. 32 "he (God) *delivered him up* for us," Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25 "*delivered* himself *up*".

[2] [927 *b*] Is. liii. 12 "*for* (ל) transgressors". Comp. Deut. xxxiii. 8, 12, 13 τῷ Λευεὶ εἶπεν, τῷ B., τῷ 'I., which a Greek would naturally render "He said *to* Levi, *to* Benjamin, *to* Joseph": but the meaning of -ל is "*concerning*".

[3] [928 *a*] Why did not the Evangelists use προδίδωμι, "betray"? Partly perhaps because this, too, was an ambiguous word. It occurs in N.T. only in Rom. xi. 35 (see Heb. of Job xli. 11) where it means "give *beforehand*". In canon. LXX it occurs only thrice, and always as an erroneous translation or various reading, 2 K. vi. 11, Is. xl. 14 A א*, Ezek. xvi. 34 A. It is worth noting, however, that in the list of the Apostles, where Mk iii. 19, Mt. x. 4 have "Judas Iscariot who also *delivered* him *up*," Lk. vi. 16 has "became a *traitor* (προδότης)"—a noun that is free from ambiguity.

but "on the same night on which he was *delivered up* [*for our sins, by the Father*]." The same correction ought almost certainly to be made in the Synoptic accounts of Christ's predictions of the Passion. This we may infer from the stress He laid on spiritual and essential things, as well as from the facts alleged above. It is well-nigh impossible that Christ should have emphasized mere details such as "spitting", "smiting", "mocking", "delivering up", &c., and yet have made no reference to His death's spiritual purport, no assertion that it was *for others*. Yet there is hardly a trace of such reference in the Synoptic predictions. The Fourth Gospel casts aside almost all the Synoptic vocabulary here—the "suffering many things", the "delivering up to the hands of the chief priests", the "spitting", "scourging", and "mocking". It prefers to speak of the Cross as a place of "glorifying" and "lifting up", and of Jesus as "drawing" men to Himself when "lifted up". Historically and verbally, the "*delivering up*" in Mark may be nearer to the actual words uttered by Jesus than the "*lifting up*" in John. But the spirit and the meaning of Christ's doctrine about suffering and trouble as a whole are incontestably better preserved by John than by any of the Synoptists.

Addendum on "taking up the cross"

[**928** (i)] Perhaps a spiritual meaning—differing from the commonly assumed one, and preparing for the glory that follows—underlies the words "*take up the cross*," which all the Synoptists place shortly before the Transfiguration, and which the Double Tradition repeats in a different context[1]. If

[1] [**928** (i) *a*] The Synoptists have (Mk viii. 34, Mt. xvi. 24, Lk. ix. 23) "If any one desireth to come after me, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross* [Lk. adds "daily"] and follow me." The Double Tradition has (Mt. x. 37–8) "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not

Jesus really used this phrase, it could hardly convey to His followers any meaning except that they must be prepared to be punished by Rome as rebels[1]. Crucifixion was a Roman, not a Jewish punishment. If a leader of the Servian insurgents in the last century said to his men, "Should you follow me, you must have before your eyes *the impaling-stake*," his meaning—on the assumption that the charges brought against the Turks in 1880 were substantiated—would be perfectly clear. Almost as clear would have been Christ's words if He had used to His followers similar language, only substituting. for "*impaling-stake*", the word "*cross*". But, this being the meaning of the utterance, could He possibly have uttered it? The silence, or explanation, of two of the N.T. commentators best acquainted with Jewish thought[2], indicates

---

worthy of me...and he that doth not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me," (Lk. xiv. 26–7) "If any one is [for] coming after me and hateth not his own father...Whoever doth not carry his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple."

[1] [928 (i) *b*] After the first century, Jews might naturally point to the Sacrifice of Isaac as constituting *their* national and mediatorial offering, and might liken Isaac, carrying the wood upon which he was to be offered, to a man carrying his own cross (Genes. r. sct. 56, 55^b, Pesik. r. sct. 31, 57^b quoted by Levy iv. 190^a, ii. 439^a and elsewhere). The simile would receive point from the persecutions undergone by the Jews under the Romans, and might be used pointedly in controversies with Christians. But no evidence has been alleged that the phrase was in use among Jews as a metaphor during the first century.

[928 (i) *c*] Professor Hermann Gollancz informs me that the simile of Isaac carrying his cross is "taken from Roman habit and quite opposed to Jewish spirit and experience. The sight of his doom was advisedly kept away from the criminal till the very last moment. 'Hanging on the gallows (צליבת קיסא)' is given by the Targum on Ruth as equivalent to חנק 'strangling'. Old Jewish illustrations of examples like Haman &c. do not give the figure †, but ⌐ or ⌐⌐."

[2] [928 (i) *d*] *Horae Hebraicae* is silent (as to the cross) on both passages of Mt. Schöttgen (on Mt. xvi. 24) says that the Greek "cross (*σταυρός*)" means both (1) the upright "stake" (Lat. "palus") and (2) the "*yoke*" (Lat. "furca"). Under the latter (928 (vi)), slaves used to be

the difficulty of the phrase, and raises the question whether it may not have sprung from some misunderstanding. The full discussion of this question must be reserved for another treatise; but the following facts are submitted as justifying a working-hypothesis that Jesus mentioned, not the "*cross*", but the "*yoke*"[1].

[928 (ii)] It was a fundamental doctrine of our Lord that entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven depended on the fulfilment of the Great Commandment to love God (implying the commandment also to love man)[2]. The verbal repetition of this Commandment—somewhat like the repetition of the Creed with us—was a daily duty for the Jews and was called "*taking on oneself the yoke*," sometimes called "*the yoke* of the

---

whipped with their hands outstretched: "As a slave", says Schöttgen, "whose hands are tied to the *yoke* (furcam) has hands indeed but cannot use them, so the Christian who would follow me, *i.e.* become my disciple, is to have tongue, wrath, hands, and passions, but must use them for no ill purpose." Wetstein (on Mt. x. 38) quotes Cicero for "furcam ferre" and Plutarch and Artemidorus for "bearing" or "carrying" the cross, but no Jewish tradition.

[1] [**928** (i) *e*] It is very important to realize that no Jewish leader in the first century, and above all no leader of Galilaeans, could call upon his followers to face crucifixion without being *supposed* to prepare them for a conflict with Rome. During Christ's childhood, Varus had crucified two thousand rebels. Under Claudius and Nero, robbers, brigands, or rebels, were frequently crucified. The sons of Judas the Galilaean suffered crucifixion. Mark and Matthew tell us that two "*brigands*" (λῃσταί) were crucified by the Romans along with Jesus. John tells us that Barabbas, a "*brigand*", under sentence of death, was saved by the multitude instead of Jesus. Luke (and similarly Mark) says that Barabbas was sentenced for "*sedition* (στάσιν) and murder." This shews that one whom Evangelists, following the Roman usage, would call a "*brigand*" or "*robber*" (λῃστής), might really be a "rebel", one whom Jews might call a "patriot" or "zealot", perhaps even a "prophet", perhaps even a Messiah. If a Galilaean prophet said to Galilaeans, "Those who are to follow me must take up the cross," Galilaeans could hardly fail to infer (rightly or wrongly) that it meant "You must be prepared to be punished *by Rome*." See **928** (x) *d* and Index II σταυρός.

[2] Mk xii. 30, Mt. xxii. 37, Lk. x. 27.

Law," "of the Kingdom of Heaven," &c., but sometimes simply "*the yoke*"[1]. Christ laid stress on the duty of serving God (*i.e.* "taking *the yoke*") *in act as well as word*, serving God by serving men. After the repetition of the Great Commandment, Jesus says to the "lawyer" (Lk. x. 28) "This *do*, and thou shalt live"; and then follows the Parable of the Good Samaritan[2].

[928 (iii)] In N.T., Matthew alone has preserved the words "Take my *yoke* upon you and learn of me," that is to say, "Become servants of one another, as I make myself your servant[3]." But the metaphor is implied in the Voice from Heaven to Saul in the Acts, where the future Apostle is told that he finds it hard to "kick against the goads" (being rebuked as a bullock that will not *submit to the yoke and draw the plough*[4]); perhaps, too, in Christ's warning that no one that has "put his hand to *the plough* and looks back" is in condition

[1] [928 (ii) *a*] The passage repeated was called *Shema*, i.e. *Hear* (from Deut. vi. 4—9 "*Hear*, O Israel"). But Deut. xi. 13—21 and Numb. xv. 37—41 were also thus named. The Mishna of Berach. ii. 2 has, "Why does *Hear* (Deut. vi. 4) precede *And it shall be if ye shall hear* (Deut. xi. 13)? In order that one may first take upon oneself *the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven and then that of the Precept*." *Hor. Hebr.* (on Mt. iii. 2) says that the Jerusalem Talmud, in this passage, omits "*the yoke of*" before "the Kingdom of Heaven." *Hor. Heb.* (*ib.*) quotes other traditions, such as, "We never saw Rabbi *taking upon himself the kingdom of heaven*," and the answer is that he did it "when he put his hands on his face": another is, "Let him wash his hands, put on his phylacteries, repeat them, and pray, *and this is the kingdom of heaven fulfilled*": another (Berach. ii. 5) mentions first the repetition of "*Hear* (O Israel)" and then a reference by R. Gamaliel to the non-repetition of it as "*laying aside the kingdom of heaven*." Schöttgen (Mt. xi. 29) gives instances of "*the yoke* of the Law, of the Precept, of Penitence, &c."

[2] Lk. x. 29—33.

[3] [928 (iii) *a*] Mt. xi. 29. The words "for I am meek and lowly in heart" imply that our Lord Himself bears the yoke that He imposes on His disciples, and that He serves those whom He commands to serve. Comp. Gal. v. 13 "Through love *be servants one to another*."

[4] Acts xxvi. 14.

to enter the Kingdom[1]; and perhaps in the old tradition of

[1] [928 (iii) *b*] Lk. ix. 62. If the present text of Lk. ix. 62 is correct, the disciple is represented, not as wearing the yoke, but as driving the yoked oxen. But this metaphor, though familiar to Greeks and to us, appears (from the silence of Wetstein and *Horae Hebraicae*) not to be common in Jewish literature. Schöttgen illustrates it only by Aboth iii. 7, which rather suggests a person taking the Yoke of the Law on himself (not ploughing) and looking idly about. Moreover, in the quotations of Lk. there are great diversities of reading (Resch), *e.g.* "put his hand to the *plough-share*"; "*turning back*" for "looking back". Also D, Clem. Alex., and Hil., place "looking back" before "putting the hand on the plough"; and some traditions mention "*furrow*" instead of "Kingdom of God". Orig. twice has βαλών for ἐπιβαλών, and Hil. has "tenens".

Perhaps the Original mentioned, not "plough", but "*ox-goad*": for in Sir. xxxviii. 25 (26) ἄροτρον represents מלמד—the regular Talmudic word (Levy iii. 134 *b*) for "*ox-goad*", rendered (R.V.) "(*ox*) *goad*" in Judg. iii. 31, where B has ἀροτρόπους, Σ. "plough-handle", ἐχέτλη (A conflates as ἐκτός *i.e.* מלבד). L.S., for ἀροτρόπους, have simply "plough-share LXX". If the original Hebrew of Lk. ix. 62 referred to an *ox kicking, or pushing back, against the ox-goad*, this, in some early Greek Gospel, may have been loosely translated "*striking against the plough.*" Then Luke may have taken βαλών (or, ἐπιβαλών) ἐπί as applied, *not to the ploughing ox, but to the ploughman*, and may have inserted χεῖρα to complete the sense.

Since writing the above, I have been informed by Mr Stanley Cook that the Syriac in Sir. xxxviii. 25 (26) actually has "*the sword of the plough* (or, *yoke*) (חרבא דפדנא)," though the phrase may mean the whole plough; and Mr F. C. Burkitt tells me that the Syriac Gospels, and other authorities, have the same phrase in Lk. ix. 62. This somewhat favours the view that the Original Hebrew in Lk., as in Ben Sira, had "*ox-goad*". It is not alleged that "the sword", in the Syriac phrase, ever means "handle" (ἐχέτλη), and the Palestinian Lectionary omits it, having merely "plough (or, yoke)".

[928 (iii) *c*] The Bib. Heb. for "*yoke*" is על, which also means "(*up*)*on*", ἐπί. The New Heb. is עול. The Targ. Heb., or Aramaic, is נירא. Hence, in passing from Bib. Heb. to Aramaic, one may expect occasional confusions. Thus "putting [away] the *yoke*" might be conflated into "putting [one's hand] *upon the yoke.*" Or the ancient term may be expanded (erroneously) as meaning anything that "goes up", עלה, as in Numb. xix. 2 (lit.) "a heifer...[upon] which never (lit) *went-up* (עלה) *upon her* (עליה) *yoke* (על)," Jer. Targ. (Etheridge) "on which no male hath come, nor the burden of any work been imposed, neither hurt

Justin that Christ, as a carpenter, "fashioned *yokes and ploughs*[1]."

[928 (iv)] It has been pointed out (928 (i)) that the Double Tradition connects the taking up of the "cross" with a precept not to love parents or children "more than me" (Luke even says "hate" them). The connection is clear now to us, but can hardly have been very clear to Jews. At all events, it would have been clearer to them if Jesus had said "yoke" instead of "cross"; for then we might regard it as a common-place of Jewish literature to be illustrated by Philo[2] and the Jerusalem Talmud, commenting on the base slave in Exodus, who says "*I love my master, my wife and my children, I will not go out free.*" This slave the Talmud condemns for *preferring the yoke of man to the yoke of God*—presumably because slaves were excluded from the obligation to attend the festivals in Jerusalem[3]. Spiritually interpreted, the picture may be made an instructive one. The servant of

by the thong, nor grieved by the goad or prick, nor collar (band), or any like yoke": cf. Hos. xi. 4 "*yoke on* (עַל עֹל)," where LXX drops "*yoke*", Lam. i. 14 "*yoke*", LXX "*on*" &c.

[1] [928 (iii) *d*] *Tryph.* § 88 *καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου (ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ* [MS. *ἀεργῆ*] *βίον).....*

[2] [928 (iv) *a*] Philo (i. 499) (on Exod. xxi. 5—6) speaks of "the unenfranchised and naturally-slavish race wherein participates [in Scripture] the man that says *I have loved my master...and my wife...and my children...I will not depart as a free man.*" The slave ought not thus, says Philo elsewhere (i. 151–2) to have imitated Laban's language (Gen. xxxi. 43, "*my* daughters...*my* sons...*my* flocks..."), but to have said "*all things are God's possessions.*" If a man does not say this, he will "be a slave for ever," and will "obtain his petition by having his ear bored through, that he may not receive the divine message concerning freedom of soul (? a free soul) (*ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας ψυχῆς*)."

[3] [928 (iv) *b*] In answer to the question why the ear was pierced, R. Jochanan b. Zachai replied: Kiddusch. i. 2 (Schwab ix. 215) "The ear heard on Mount Sinai the second commandment, *Thou shalt have none other gods before me*: in spite of that, it shook off *the yoke* of divine worship (le joug du culte divin) and preferred the *yoke* of man." The Mishna (Chag. 1 *a*) exempts slaves from attendance at the Feasts.

God is to go forth from the habitations of this world, denying or renouncing kith and kin, and his very self, as well as all worldly possessions, calling no one and nothing *his own* after the flesh, but receiving back houses and kinsfolk a hundred-fold, because he receives them back as gifts of God[1]. In this sense, if Christ bade His disciples take up the yoke, and follow Him, His meaning would be intelligible to all.

[928 (v)] And this sense might indirectly include the Christian "cross". For Isaiah is said by a Jewish tradition to have "taken the kingdom of heaven upon himself" when he cried to God, "Here am I, send me"—exposing himself to persecution that culminated in martyrdom[2]. Jeremiah connects bearing the *yoke* with giving one's cheek to the smiter[3]. Akiba is said to have been taking *the yoke* on himself in the moment when he breathed his last under torments, taking it in a double sense, because he was repeating the *Shema*, or Creed, with his lips, and also "loving God with his soul, or life (ψυχῇ) (נפש)" by giving it up for the glory of His Name[4].

[1] Mk x. 30, Mt. xix. 29, Lk. xviii. 30.

[2] Schöttg. (on Mt. xi. 29) quoting Jalkut Sim. part 2, fol. 43 *a*.

[3] Lam. iii. 27—30.

[4] [928 (v) *a*] B. Berach. 61 *b* transl. thus by Taylor (Aboth, n. on iii. 20) "When 'Aqiba was being led out to execution, it was the time of reading the *Shema*', and they were combing his flesh with combs of iron, and he was receiving upon him the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven (*i.e.* reciting the *Shema*'). To his disciples who remonstrate, 'Thus far, thou hast endured enough': 'all my days (said he) I have been troubled about this verse: Thou shalt love the Lord...with all thy soul, even if He should take away thy spirit'" (? *breath*, נשמתך, but Goldschm. gives v. r. נפשך and has "Seele", which Pinner also has). "'When, said I, will it be in my power to fulfil this? Now that I have the opportunity shall I not fulfil it?'"

Even if Akiba was not actually driven to execution under the "yoke" called by the Romans "furca" (928 (vi)), it is easy to see that Gentiles might interpret such a narrative literally, and that a Greek narrator of the story might tell how the scourgers combed the Martyr's flesh while he "*carried his cross*". "Comb", ξαίνω, is the word regularly used by Dion. Hal. for "scourging", and in particular for the scourging of a slave

Thus Jews themselves might regard the "*yoke*" as sometimes preparatory for martyrdom. Christian Jews would certainly regard it as preparatory for the martyrdom of the Cross.

[**928** (vi)] When the Romans crucified a slave, they whipped him through the streets to the cross, which was, as a rule, fixed outside the city. During the whipping, his hands were stretched out apart from each other, fastened to a yoke, collar, or other wooden framework that was placed on, or round, his neck. Probably remaining attached to this framework, the slave was raised to the cross, and nailed, or bound, to the latter. The Romans are not alleged ever to have used the phrase "*bear the cross* (crux)". But the "*bearing of the yoke* (furca)" was so familiar to them that the name "*yoke-bearer* (furcifer)" became as proverbial as "gallows-bird" with us. Suppose, then, that an Apostle preached in the Roman Church (which was largely composed of slaves) the doctrine that the Son of God, to redeem mankind, assumed (Philipp. ii. 7) "the form of a slave," "took upon Himself *the yoke*," and bade His servants follow His example; would not the Roman converts naturally combine this "bearing of the yoke" with the historical fact of the crucifixion, and infer the meaning to be that our Lord became, for man's sake, a "*Furcifer*", *a bearer of the yoke that led to the cross?*

[**928** (vii)] The Greek word "yoke", ζυγός (of course excluding Rev. vi. 5 "balance"), occurs thrice in N.T. (outside Matthew) meaning (once) literal slavery, and (twice) *the bondage of the Jewish Law as opposed to the freedom of the Gospel*[1]. The fear of confusing the yoke of Christ with the

described by Plutarch below (**928** (vii) *b*) as a "furcifer", Dion. Hal. vii. 69 ξύλῳ προσδήσαντες...παρηκολούθουν ξαίνοντες μάστιξι....

[1] [**928** (vii) *a*] Acts xv. 10 "Why tempt ye God that ye should place on the necks of the disciples a *yoke* that neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in like manner as they," Gal. v. 1 "With freedom did Christ set us free. Stand fast therefore and be not entangled again in a *yoke* of bondage."

yoke of the Law might prevent Greek Evangelists from rendering the phrase "take up the *yoke*" literally, and might predispose them to accept the identification of "the yoke" with "the yoke that led to the cross," *i.e.* with the "furca". But there was no one Greek term that exactly satisfied the two conditions of (1) corresponding to the Latin crucificial "furca", (2) being free from vernacular associations[1]. Hence the Greek writers may have adopted the phrase "bear *the*

[1] [928 (vii) *b*] Plutarch *Vit. Coriol.* 24, and again, *Quaest. Rom.* lxx. mentioning a historical instance of the flogging of a slave, and taking occasion to explain the term "furcifer", describes the φούρκα (furca) as being "what the Greeks call ὑποστάτης, στήριγμα" or στήριγξ. Dionys. Hal. vii. 69 mentioning the same instance, calls it a ξύλον, plank, or plank-work, that was fastened round the breast and shoulders.

[928 (vii) *c*] Herodotus, using the words (vii. 33) ζῶντα πρὸς σανίδα προσδιεπασσάλευσαν, and then (*describing the same act*) (ix. 120) σανίδα προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν, perhaps implies that the man was first nailed to the σανίς, and then the σανίς was nailed to a stake or tree. Plutarch's expression (*Vit. Pericl.* 28) σανίσι προσδήσας ἐφ' ἡμέρας δέκα (of sufferers who are said to have been afterwards beaten to death) shews that "binding to the σανίς," like the nailing to the σανίς in Herodotus, might be briefly used for "crucifying". In Aristoph. *Thesm.* 931–40, a man who is to be bound by a policeman "*in* the σανίς" (afterwards "*to* the σανίς") begs that he may not "*feed the crows*" in the garments he is wearing—which shews that he regards the binding *in* (or *to*) the σανίς as preliminary to exposure on some elevated place where he will be left to die without receiving burial.

[928 (vii) *d*] Eusebius (viii. 8. 1) describes martyrs crucified and dying of hunger "on the very *planks* (ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἰκρίων)," and Lipsius (*De Cruce*, p. 101) quotes an ancient anonymous writer who says that the Jews nailed the Saviour ἰκρίῳ.

[928 (vii) *e*] We have seen (928 (vii) *b*) that Plutarch calls the "*furca*" a στήριγξ. Hesychius says concerning στήριγγες that some apply the term to the δίκρουν, "fork, placed under the yoke of the chariot" (when the horses are unharnessed) (where Lipsius (p. 68) would read ῥυμῷ for ζύγῳ). Lipsius—whose facts and arguments have not been appreciated by Zöckler—also quotes (p. 63) "Glossae veteres. *Furcifer*, σταυροκόμιστος, δικρανοφόρος," translating the Greek "qui patibulum fert, qui furcam." Even if σταυροκόμιστος should mean "*conveyed to* the cross," the gloss indicates how naturally people might say that the "furcifer" "conveyed his cross": but if Lipsius is right, this is a case where a man

cross" (instead of "bear the *yoke*, or *collar*, or *plank*, or *fork*, or *cross-piece*") although in fact the actual "*cross*" was seldom "borne".

[928 (viii)] If these conclusions are correct we may infer that one reason why John never puts the word "cross" into our Lord's mouth is, that He never used it. Another reason may have been that the word seemed to give undue prominence to the *exceptional suffering* of a Martyr, and did not give due prominence to the aspect of *continuous service*. Luke, indeed, brings in the continuousness by adding the phrase (ix. 23) "*daily*", and this was of use in making readers think about the essence of the metaphor: but still, the aspect

---

conveying the Latin "yoke" was said in Greek to be conveying his "cross".

[928 (vii) *f*] Hesychius says, Σανίς. *θύρα. λεύκωμα ἐν ᾧ αἱ γραφαὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐγράφοντο πρὸς τοὺς κακούργους.* **τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταύρου.** It is generally agreed that σταυροῦ should be substituted for *ταύρου*. But Alberti takes the meaning to be "*a tablet placed on the cross*" ("respicitur ad Joann. xix. 19...*ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ*"). More prob. *τίθεται ἐπὶ* signifies "*is applied to*", i.e. "*is used to mean.*" Comp. *ib.* ii. 1082 *τὸ μὲν γὰρ* Βόμβαξ **τίθεται καὶ ἐπὶ** *σχετλιασμοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ γέλωτος, ib.* ii. 728 *Οἰναῖοι τὴν χαράδραν. παροιμία* **τιθεμένη ἐπὶ** *τῶν...* (also *ib.* ii. 1206 *σκέλος,* **τάσσεται** *ἐπὶ τοῦ φορτικοῦ*, and ii. 277 *κληῖδες,* **τάσσεται δὲ ἐπὶ** *τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου μέρους*). If so, Hesychius means that the word *σανίς*, though strictly signifying the whipping-collar of plank-work that was preliminary to the cross, *is sometimes used to signify the stake, or the cross as a whole, or to indicate crucifixion* (as it does in Herodotus and Aristophanes).

[928 (vii) *g*] Deut. xxi. 22 describes "hanging" (תלה) on a "*tree*" (עץ) (which may mean "stake"). Onk. uses צלב for "hang", and says "Thou shalt *hang* him on a *hanging-post* (צליבא)." But Jer. Targ. substitutes for "hanging-post" a word meaning "*plank-work*", קיסא. The same three words occur in Gen. xl. 19 Bib. "*tree*", Onk. "*hanging-post*", Jer. "*plank-work*". This indicates that in Hebrew, as well as in Greek and Latin, there may have been a confusion between two words meaning quite distinct things (1) the *stake*, or *cross*, which was rarely or never borne by the condemned, (2) the *plank-work*, called by many different names, which was regularly borne to the cross by slaves that were to be crucified. The "bearing" of this "*plank-work*" appears to have been sometimes called "bearing the *cross*".

of *service*, as a condition for entrance into the Kingdom, was somewhat subordinated in the Gospels, until the Fourth Evangelist introduced "the washing of feet" as a kind of sacramental type of "taking up the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven."

[**928** (ix)] If we admit that "*Take the yoke*" meant originally "Take the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven," and, in our Lord's lips, "Serve the Father by serving His children," and if we add, hypothetically, that it may have been confused with "*taking up the cross*," then it may be shewn that there is a parallelism between the Synoptists and John in the words of Christ that severally precede the Voice at the Transfiguration and the Johannine Voice from Heaven.

[**928** (x)] In the Synoptists, the warning is that a man desiring to *come after* Jesus must "deny himself and *take up the cross* and *follow*" Him; and the Double Tradition adds that he must not be prevented by love of wife or children, nay, according to Luke, that he must "*hate*" them, and even "*hate his own life* (ψυχήν)." But how perplexing must these words have been for a Jewish listener: "If I desire to 'come after,' then I must 'follow'! And I am to *hate* my wife and children! And I am to take up the torturing cross of Rome! What"—he might well ask—"does all this mean?" John suggests a new meaning thus: (xii. 24) "Except the grain of wheat...die, it abideth by itself alone: but, if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it, and he that *hateth his life* (ψυχήν) *in this world shall preserve it for life* (ζωήν) *eternal. If any man would serve me, let him follow me*," *i.e.* "If any man would take my yoke upon him, let him cast off the world's yoke, dying to the servitude of the flesh that he may live in the freedom of the Spirit." This he explains by describing the Lord as washing the feet of the disciples like a servant, and as bidding them do the same for one another. Later on, it is shewn that this yoke may lead to persecution, *i.e.* the cross, (xv. 20) "The servant is not greater

than his master. If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you." But still the "yoke" is *not* "the cross". The yoke means "serving" as Christ "served"[1].

[1] [928 (x) *a*] Zestermann's treatise on the Cross (Leipzig, Parts I. and II., 1867–8) contains an extremely valuable and impartial collection of fully quoted passages from ancient authors: but his conclusions are not equally valuable. He (II. p. 5) mistranslates (928 (vii) *c*) Herod. ix. 120 **σανίδα προσπασσαλεύσαντες**, "einen vierkantigen Pfahl mit Pflöcken (senkrecht im Boden) befestigt hatten"; he (I. p. 14) merely refers to the Schol. on (928 (vii) *c*) Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 940, and does not see that the passage implies crucifixion; he dissents from Lipsius' interpretation of (I. p. 20) (928 (vii) *b*) Dion. Hal. vii. 64 (69); he rejects the evidence of some ancient writers on the ground that they named the instrument of punishment (*ib.* p. 21) "in an arbitrary way (willkürlich)"; he quotes (II. p. 29) the evidence of Christian writers as to "bearing the cross", failing to perceive that such writers would naturally follow the language of the Gospels. Zöckler adopts Zestermann's mistranslations and errors without imitating his impartiality and ampleness of quotation.

[928 (x) *b*] Zestermann (I. p. 14) quotes Hesych. Ἰκρίον, *σανίδωμα ἢ ξύλον ἐν ᾧ οἱ κακοῦργοι ξέονται*, and adds Lipsius' conj. *δέονται*. But Alberti suggests *ξαίνονται* (which might be written *ξεονται*)—an almost certain emendation (see 928 (v) *a* for *ξαίνω*, "scourge"). Alb. also quotes Cyrill. Lex. MS. Voss. *ἰκρίον. σταυρὸς, φοῦρκα, ξύλον, ἐν ᾧ οἱ κακοῦργοι κρέμανται*, which interchanges *φοῦρκα* and *σταυρός*.

[928 (x) *c*] The upright and massive stake of the cross—at least 13 ft. long, and higher for distinguished criminals, allowing 3 or 4 ft. in the ground to resist pressure of ladder, strain of hoisting &c.—could not be borne by the condemned alone without retarding, if not stopping, the procession, by its weight and swaying. In exceptional cases, where a cross had not been erected beforehand, it might perhaps (Lk. xxiii. 26) be laid on two men. But the conclusion remains unshaken that it was *not a Roman custom to bear the cross*, but only to bear the *patibulum*, *furca*, or "*yoke*".

[928 (x) *d*] Of course, the Jews were familiar with crucifixion, as a heathen punishment, and there was precedent for it (Joseph. *Bell.* i. 4. 6) even under a Jewish ruler. But the precedent was thought (*ib.*) "impious". The fact remains that, in the mouth of a Galilaean A.D. 30, "Prepare to be crucified" would mean, "Prepare to be *punished by Rome*." See Index II, *σταυρός*.

CHAPTER II

CHRIST'S ONE PRAYER

§ 1. *The Synoptic versions and their meanings*

[**929**] FROM the consideration of Christ's "exceeding sorrow", or "trouble", we pass to the prayer called forth by that sorrow or trouble. According to Mark—unless the first utterance about "the hour" and the "cup" is to be regarded as two prayers—Jesus offers up *one* prayer and probably (see **932** *a*) repeats it *once*. According to Matthew, He utters *two* distinct prayers at different times, and repeats the *second*, so as to justify Matthew in saying, as he alone says, that Jesus "*prayed the third time*[1]." All these distinctions disappear in Luke. So they do in John; who represents Jesus as rejecting one prayer, and adopting another, but not as uttering two different prayers.

[**930**] Mark, alone of the Synoptists, mentions "*hour*" as well as "*cup*". John mentions "*hour*" here, but "*cup*" much later on, in the moment of the arrest—and there, not in a prayer but in words accepting the cup from the Father.

[**931**] These differences will be discussed further on; but there are so many difficulties in the text that the first step

[1] [**929** *a*] The parallel Mk also mentions "*third time*", but quite differently ("*came the third time*," no mention being made of "praying").

must be to ascertain the exact meanings of the words in the four accounts, which are as follows:

(i) *The first Synoptic form*

Mk xiv. 35–6 (lit.)

"He prayed in order that, if it is [indeed][1] possible, there might pass from him the hour: and he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee[3]. Cause-to-pass[4] this cup from me. But [it is] not [the ques-

Mt. xxvi. 39 (lit.)

"...praying and saying, My Father, if it is [indeed][1] possible, let-there-pass[4] from me this cup. Only, [it is]

Lk. xxii. 42 (lit.)

"He prayed, saying, Father, if thou dost so purpose[2], cause-to-pass[4] this cup from me. Only

---

[1] [**931** *a*] "Is [indeed]". Unless a writer wishes to emphasize "is", it is omitted in Gk as in Eng. ("if possible"). The insertion "is" shews the meaning to be "if it *is indeed* possible"—although there is a difficulty (at all events on the surface) in combining this with "all things are possible," which Mk alone has.

[**931** *b*] D (lit.) "he prayed *if it is* [*indeed*] *possible* that...," προσηύχετο εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν ἵνα.... In Hebraic Greek, this might mean "[saying] *Is it really* possible that...?" implying "It is *not* possible." Comp. Mk viii. 12 εἰ δοθήσεται; lit. "*If* there shall be given?" where Mt. xvi. 4, Lk. xi. 29 have "There shall *not* be given."

[2] [**931** *c*] "Purpose", βούλει, implying a combination of "desire" and "plan".

[3] [**931** *d*] Mk xiv. 36, SS "all things are possible *in thy hands*," which suggests an original "all things are *in thy hands*" conflated as "*possible*".

[4] [**931** *e*] Mk-Lk. "Cause-to-pass (παρένεγκε)," Mt. "Let-there-pass (παρελθάτω)." It is certain that Mark, or his editor, regards παραφέρω as meaning "*cause to pass*" here, since he adds "*from me*" (and so Lk.). But παραφέρω, when used with "food", "meat", "cups", "dish" &c., regularly means "*serve up*", "*lay before* (*a guest*)," "*present*". Possibly Mk is in error (see below **975–7**). Mt. substitutes a word about which there is no ambiguity. R.V. has "*remove*" for "*cause-to-pass*".

Mk xiv. 35–36 (lit.)	Mt. xxvi. 39 (lit.)	Lk. xxii. 42 (lit.)
tion] what[1] I will but what thou."	not[1] as I will but as thou."	not my will but thine be done[2]."

[1] [**931** *f*] The instances in which *τίς*, *τί*, "who?" "what?" have been alleged to be used for *ὅς*, *ὅ* "(he) who", "(that) which", appear either probably corrupt, or capable of interrogative rendering, *e.g.* Sir. vi. 34 "*Who* is wise? Cleave unto him," *i.e.* "Can you find a wise man? Then do not let him go." So Ath. x. 438 E *τίνι ἡ τύχη δίδωσι λαβέτω* (quoted by Swete *ad loc.* from Blass) may be rendered, "To *whom* does fortune give [her gifts]? Let him take them." In Lev. xxi. 17 "A man of thy seed...*that* (אשר) hath a blemish," *ἄνθρωπος...ὑμῶν τίνι ἐὰν ᾖ ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμος*, may well be corr. for *υμῶωτινι*, *i.e.* *ὑμῶν ὅτινι*. In Deut. xxix. 18, "lest there be any man...or tribe, whose (אשר) heart," *μή τίς ἐστιν...ἢ φυλή, τίνος ἡ διάνοια*, the negative *μή* (if it has not dropped after *-η*) may be intended to be repeated before *τινος* (according to Hebrew idiom) ("lest there be any man or woman...or tribe, [*lest*, *I say*] *any* man's heart").

[**931** *g*] In Judg. ix. 48 (R.V.) "*What* ye *have* seen me do...," and elsewhere, R.V. gives a relative, but Gesen. (553 *a*) an interrogative rendering. The same variation is shewn in Judg. ix. 48 by LXX (*ὅ*) and A (*τί*). The latter is the more exact.

[**931** *h*] In any case, this use of the interrogative for the relative is confined to instances where *the apodosis is expressed*, e.g. "What thou wilt (or, wilt thou?) *I will do* (or, *do it*)." But in Mk xiv. 36 *it is not expressed*. Moreover, this use is not at present attested in Greek of Mk's period. Consequently we are bound to assume that in Mk the meaning is interrogative, if it makes sense. And it makes excellent sense. Prof. Swete says, "We may paraphrase: 'However the question is not (*οὐ*, not *μή*) what is My will'." But this is *not* a *paraphrase*. It is an exact translation. The R.V. "*Not* what I will" is doubly wrong, 1st, because "*not*" in such an English clause would mean "*let* it *not* be" (which is incompatible with the Gk *οὐ*), 2nd, because "*what*", in such an English clause, would mean "*that which*" (which is incompatible with the Gk *τί*).

[**931** *i*] Matthew altered Mark's interrogative into "*as*", but omitted to alter the *οὐ* to *μή*. Hence Mt. xxvi. 39 is rendered above "only [*it is*] not as I will." Perhaps Matthew wished his words to be taken as meaning "[it is] not [to be arranged] as I will." In any case the words cannot express a wish. See below (**1009** foll.).

[2] [**931** *j*] D alters the order, "Father, not my will but thine be done. If thou dost so purpose, cause-to-pass this cup from me."

[932] Mark and Matthew give the following repetitions of the prayer:

(ii) *The second Synoptic form*

Mk xiv. 39	Mt. xxvi. 42 (lit.)	Lk. om.
"And again having gone away he prayed [having said the same words (lit. word)][1]."	"Again a second time having gone away he prayed [saying] My Father, if [it] is not possible [for] this to pass except I drink it, thy will be done."	

(iii) *The third Synoptic form*

Mk. om.	Mt. xxvi. 44	Lk. om.
	"And having left them again having gone away he prayed the third time[2] having said the same word again[3]."	

§ 2. *The Johannine Version*

[933] (Jn xii. 27) "Now is my soul troubled. But *why* should I say, 'Father save me from this hour'? Nay, for this cause came I, to [meet] this hour. 'Father, glorify thy name[4].'"

[1] [932 *a*] Diatessaron and D omit the words bracketed by W.H. Probably they are genuine, and omitted for the sake of harmonizing Mk and Mt. (see below 949 foll.).

[2] [932 *b*] D omits "the third time" (prob. in order to harmonize Mk and Mt.).

[3] [932 *c*] "The same word again": Diatess. om. "again", and W.H. marg. connects it with the following verse. SS has, "left them, and went to pray the third time, and again he spake the same way."

[4] [933 *a*] Jn xii. 27 νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται· καὶ τί εἴπω, Πάτερ

Here, John mentions only the "hour". Later on, he mentions the "cup", but in a context entirely different from that of the Synoptists, and in an extraordinary construction to which the commentators have found no parallel in classical Greek literature except in an exclamatory instance from Epictetus, which, being in the 3rd person, is no real parallel. Very few instances occur in the LXX[1].

(Jn xviii. 11) "Put [back] the sword into the sheath. The cup that the Father hath given me, *I am of course* (or, *according to thy will*) *not to drink it*[2]*!*"

σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην· Πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. For καί="but", see **937**. For τί="*why?*" as being more probable than "*what?*" see **938–40**. It is, of course, not a question for information, but equivalent to "How could I possibly say?"

[1] [**933** *b*] Epict. iii. 22. 33 introduces Agamemnon lamenting because his poor Greeks "are going to die, slaughtered by the Trojans." The Stoic replies, "But if the Trojans do not kill them, *then* [*according to you*] *they cannot possibly die* (ἂν δ' αὐτοὺς οἱ Τρῶες μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωσι) [*i.e.* they are insured against death for ever]!" The king's answer is, "Yes [they will die] but not all at one blow."

[**933** *c*] In Ruth iii. 1 ("*Shall I not* (לֹא) seek rest for thee"), οὐ μὴ ζητήσω perhaps means, "[*According to thy will*] I am not to [*discharge the duty of a mother toward thee and*] seek rest for thee!" Lk. xviii. 7 "But God will not take vengeance for his elect (ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ἐκδικήσῃ)!" is the only instance alleged from N.T. The context seems to give it an antithetical meaning, "The unjust judge takes action—and God [*forsooth*] will not take action!" In 1 S. xx. 12, according to A.V. (and perhaps according to LXX) οὐ μή depends upon an implied "if". In 2 S. ii. 26, Nehem. ii. 3, Rev. xv. 4, the interrogative force depends severally (not on οὐ μή but) on a contextual ἕως πότε; διὰ τί; and τίς.

[2] [**933** *d*] Jn xviii. 11 Βάλε τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὴν θήκην· τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό; The two best Latin MSS, a and b, render it "*Thou dost not wish me* (non vis) to drink it," as though Peter's action implied "Thou *shalt not* (οὐ μή) drink the cup" and our Lord repeats "*Shall not* drink the cup that the Father hath given me!" Somewhat similarly, in answer to requests, "do this", the answer is "I am to do this!" (*i.e.* "You would have me do this unreasonable thing!") in the literal rendering of 2 S. xi. 11 "The ark and Israel abide in tents...*and* [*according to thy will*] *I am to go to my house!*" 2 S. xv. 20 "Thy coming is but yesterday...*and* [*according to thy will*] *I am to make thee an exile!*"

[934] Before proceeding to state the reasons for adopting the above rendering of the Prayer about the "hour", attention

[933 *e*] It is natural, at first sight, to suspect Jn's text to be corrupt, and it is easy to suggest plausible emendations. For example, the original might be "The cup that my (μου) Father hath given me, *am I not* (?) *to* (μὴ) drink it? (τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ μου μὴ πίω αὐτό;)" By dropping μ in μου, this might have been corrupted into the present text, οὐ μή. But is it likely that μὴ πίω would be used by John to mean "Am I not to drink?" And does μή ever mean *nonne?*

[933 *f*] Compare Plato *Rep.* 335 C Ἀνθρώπους δὲ...μὴ οὕτω φῶμεν βλαπτομένους...χείρους γίγνεσθαι; where Jannaris has simply (1813) μὴ οὕτω φῶμεν; "shall we not say so?" In view of the freq. use (see below) of μὴ-φῶμεν; "are we to *deny?*" possibly (despite the intervening οὕτω and the answering (**979** *c*) πάνυ μὲν οὖν) the meaning is "But as to *men*—after asserting above that *horses* and *dogs* become worse by being hurt—*are we to deny* (μὴ φῶμεν)...?" According to this view μὴ φῶμεν implies a previous φῶμεν and is to be taken as *a negative verb* μὴ-φῶμεν *equivalent to* ἀρνησώμεθα. This would apply to several of the instances collected by Stallbaum on Plat. *Rep.* VIII. 7, 552 E (Μὴ οὖν οἰώμεθα (vulg. οἰόμεθα); where D. and V. have "Is it or is it not our opinion?" and where the sense may be influenced by what precedes "Since this is the case *are we* (lit.) *to not-suppose*, i.e. *to be precluded from supposing*?"). Stallbaum's instances (see also Goodwin, *Syntax*, 293) are as follows (but I quote the text more fully and omit Xen. *Mem.* I. 2. 36 μηδέ, as I am dealing with μή):—

Sophist. p. 249 A Ἀλλὰ νοῦν μὲν ἔχειν, ζωὴν δὲ μὴ φῶμεν; *Sophist.* p. 256 C ἆρα τῶν μὲν τριῶν ἕτερον αὐτὴν φήσομεν εἶναι, τοῦ δὲ τετάρτου μὴ φῶμεν, ὁμολογήσαντες αὐτὰ εἶναι πέντε, περὶ ὧν καὶ ἐν οἷς προὐθέμεθα σκοπεῖν; *Hipp. Mai.* p. 303 A Φῶμεν οὖν ἀμφότερα μὲν καλὰ εἶναι, ἑκάτερον δὲ μὴ φῶμεν; Xen. *Mem.* I. 2. 45 πότερον βίαν φῶμεν, ἢ μὴ φῶμεν εἶναι; *Legg.* IX. p. 858 C–D Πότερον οὖν τοῖς μὲν τῶν ἄλλων συγγράμμασι...προσέχωμεν τὸν νοῦν, τοῖς δὲ τῶν νομοθετῶν μὴ προσέχωμεν; ἢ πάντων μάλιστα; *Rep.* I. p. 337 B μὴ ἀποκρίνωμαι ὧν προεῖπες μηδέν; (this may mean "Am I really to be precluded from answering?" so D. and V. "Am I to be precluded?"). *Rep.* VIII. p. 554 B τόδε δὲ σκόπει· κηφηνώδεις ἐπιθυμίας ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν ἀπαιδευσίαν μὴ φῶμεν ἐγγίνεσθαι, τὰς μὲν πτωχικάς, τὰς δὲ κακούργους...; (in quoting this, Stallbaum omits σκόπει which, with different punctuation (as to which Stallbaum himself varies), might influence the construction. But the text, as it stands, may be rendered "*Are we to deny?*"). See **979** *c*.

[933 *g*] Jannaris (1813) quotes Demosth. 21, 35 ὁ τοιοῦτος μὴ δῷ δίκην; without note of various reading. But Jannaris omits πότερα (which makes all the difference). The text runs as follows, ὁ τοιοῦτος **πότερα** μὴ δῷ διὰ τοῦτο δίκην ἢ κἂν μείζω δοίη δικαίως; ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι μείζω, "Can it be that

must be called to the Synoptic use of the very same Greek words as those in John (*οὐ μὴ πίω*), only in a context so different that they must be rendered in the ordinary way, "*I will surely not drink.*"

Mk. xiv. 25 (lit.)	Mt. xxvi. 29	Lk. xxii. 18
"Verily I say unto you that no longer *surely will I* (lit.) *not drink* from the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."	"But I say unto you, *I will surely not drink* from this moment from this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father."	"For I say unto you, *I will surely not drink* from the present time from the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God come."

The strong Greek negation "*I will surely not*" *is never used by Christ about Himself in the Synoptic Gospels except in this passage*[1]. *It is only used in John here and in one other*

such a rascal is to *avoid paying* any penalty at all, or should he justly pay a greater one? I think, greater." In *theory*, a quasi-affirmative interrogative *μή* with the subjunctive *might* correspond to a quasi-affirmative interrogative *οὐ* with the indicative. But in *practice* the usage seems non-existent, because *μή* = *ἀ* privative. See **979** *c*. (In Xen. *Oec.* iv. 4 *ἆρα μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν*; the interrogative means "*num?*").

[**933** *h*] (1) *In Biblical Greek*, interrogative *μή* appears to be *quasi-negative* in Judg. ix. 9, 11, 13 (A) "Am I bound to go?" *μὴ πορευθῶ*; (LXX *πορεύσομαι*) implying that the speaker is *not* bound. In Mk xii. 15, *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*; *μή* should certainly be taken as part of a negative verb, *μὴ-δῶμεν*, and the question is implied by the preceding "Are we to give or—," so that *μὴ-δῶμεν* means simply "refrain-from-giving".

[**933** *i*] (2) The emendation suggested in **933** *e* is improbable because *μου*, "my", would be more likely to be inserted after "Father" (as it is by some MSS. in Jn viii. 38, xv. 10) than to be corrupted into *οὐ*, especially since *οὐ* introduces an almost unprecedented construction.

[**933** *j*] (3) It will be noticed (**934**), that *οὐ μὴ πίω occurs also in the Synoptic account of the night before the Crucifixion.* This, of itself, gives good grounds for thinking that Jn is *putting a new interpretation upon an old tradition, and that his text, though extremely difficult, is not corrupt.*

[1] Luke, however, uses it twice here (Lk. xxii. 16—18) "I will *surely not* eat...I will *surely not* drink."

passage[1]. This being the case, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that when the four Evangelists agree in applying this rare negation to the "drinking of the cup," they are all referring to the same original, differently interpreted. The Synoptists take the phrase negatively, "I will surely not drink from *this* (or, *the*) *fruit of the vine*." John—if his difficult text is genuine, as it probably is—appears to have taken it as an affirmative, implied under a negative, referring to the "cup" of Messianic suffering, and conveying a remonstrance to the disciples: "Put up the sword [and conform to the *divine* Will. If ye have *your* will] *I am not to drink the cup the Father hath given me!*"

[**935**] If this explanation is right, we are just now in the province of Greek tradition; for the facts indicate divergent renderings of one and the same Greek original. This the Synoptists seem to have interpreted according to the ordinary rules of Greek syntax and to have amplified so as to make sense; but John appears to have regarded it as a fervid utterance, not indeed ungrammatical, and not requiring much amplification, but needing in the interpreter a mind in sympathy with the intense devotion of the Son to the will of the Father.

[**936**] John may be wrong, and the Synoptists right. But in any case this comparison of their language about the "*cup*" has an important bearing on the prayer about the "*hour*"; for John's divergence as to the former prepares us for his divergence as to the latter. And the fact that John's tradition about the "*cup*" is obscure, abrupt, and liable to be misinterpreted in a sense exactly opposite to the one intended, should prevent us from being surprised at the recurrence of the same phenomena in his version of the prayer about the "*hour*". Indeed it appears as though the Evangelist, knowing that Christ's utterances at this stage had been divergently and erroneously reported, wished to place before his readers

[1] Jn vi. 37 οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω.

such an account of the matter as might explain how the divergence arose. He almost seems to say, in effect, "The three words that the old Evangelists record, I also record: but the true context gives them an altogether new meaning."

[**937**] We return to the words before the prayer. These, as we contend, ought to be rendered, "Now is my soul troubled. *But* (*καί*) *why* should I say, 'Father, save me from this hour'?"

The first point to be noted is that the Greek "*and*" has here the meaning of "*but*". So it has elsewhere in John, *e.g.* "Did not Moses give you the Law? *But* (or, *and yet*) none of you doeth the Law," "And ye will leave me alone. *But* (or, *and yet*) I am not alone[1]." In both these passages R.V. has "*and* [*yet*]" (correctly following A.V.); and it would have done well to follow A.V. elsewhere, *e.g.* "They sought to seize him, *but* (so A.V., but R.V. *and*) none laid hands on him," "Ye say that he is your God, *yet* (so A.V., but R.V. *and*) ye have not known him[2]." The truth is that John often uses "*and*" as in Hebrew; where the same particle (*vaw*) may mean "*and*" or "*but*"[3], and the reader must choose between them. So here, we might adopt "and": but, if we did, we should have to paraphrase thus, "Now is my soul receiving [*the*] *trouble* [*appointed by the Father*][4]; *and* [*that being the case*] how could I possibly ask that it should be removed?" But the simplest connection is, "Now is my soul troubled: *but* [*in spite of the trouble*] how could I ask to be saved from my hour?"

[**938**] The next question is whether τί should be rendered "*why*" or "*what*" in the sentence "*Why* (or, *what*) should

[1] Jn vii. 19, xvi. 32.

[2] Jn vii. 30, viii. 55.

[3] [**937** *a*] In O.T., the A.V. "*and*" is changed by R.V. into "*but*", in Gen. xv. 15, xxxvii. 22, xliv. 17, l. 24, Exod. ix. 7, 16, xii. 10 &c. In these passages the LXX mostly has δέ, but in Exod. ix. 16 καί, as also in Lev. xiv. 8, Numb. xi. 25 &c.

[4] [**937** *b*] For the Johannine view about "trouble", as being accepted by the Son in accordance with the Father's will, see **920** foll.

I say, 'Father, save me'?" The rendering "*why*" is in accordance with the rule that when a transitive verb of speech is followed by the words spoken, these words are the object of the verb. But, in the present instance, by repeating "*should I say?*" it is possible to obtain the meaning, "*What* should I say? [Should I say] 'Father, save me'?" In favour, however, of the former (the rendering "*Why?*") may be urged both Biblical usage and also accordance with the Johannine conception of Christ, as follows.

[**939**] In Hebrew O.T., there are several instances of a somewhat similar use of "*wherefore?*" or "*why?*" *to introduce what ought not to be said*, e.g. "*Wherefore* should the heathen *say*, 'Where is now their God?'?" and "*Why sayest* thou, O Jacob, and speakest thou, O Israel, 'My way is hid from the Lord[1]'?" On the other hand, there is perhaps no instance in the whole of O.T. where a speaker says "*What* should I say? [*Should I say*] *this or that*[2]?" Such a question would denote a distraction of mind with which we are familiar in Greek and English drama. But it is certainly not Hebraic, whereas the expression of the negative by the interrogative permeates Hebrew literature. A special instance was given above (**918**) from the refrain of the 42nd Psalm, "*Why* art thou disquieted, O my soul?" and it was shewn that Mark has probably used the language of that refrain in introducing Christ's prayer, and has missed the Psalmist's meaning by missing the negative force of the Hebraic inter-

[1] "*Wherefore* &c.", Ps. lxxix. 10, cxv. 2, Joel ii. 17, "*Why sayest thou* &c.," Is. xl. 27.

[2] [**939** *a*] In *classical Gk*, πῶς λέγεις; πῶς εἶπας are as common as the English "*How* say you?", in the sense "*What* say you?" But Jn xiv. 9 πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Δεῖξον, does not mean "*How* sayest thou? [Sayest thou] Shew us the Father?" but "*How cometh it to pass that thou* [my disciple, bound to know better] *sayest*, Shew us the Father?"

In Mk ii. 24 ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν seems, from a glance at the words by themselves, to mean, "See *what* they are doing," but is shewn, by what follows, to mean, "See! *Why* are they doing...?"

rogative. If so, there is all the more reason why John should use the Hebraic construction here in such a way as to indicate indirectly the source of Mark's error[1].

[940] A still more cogent reason for accepting the rendering "*Why* should I say?" and for rejecting "*What* should I say?" is that, whereas the former, in accordance with Hebrew thought, amounts to a vehement negation, and implies no kind of doubt or oscillation, the latter exhibits the Lord—who is in the Fourth Gospel the omniscient Logos—as asking a question for information about the course He is to pursue, or the words He is to utter. That, in itself, is highly improbable. Still more improbable is it that this question should be immediately answered by Himself in the wrong way by a prayer that He, as it were, puts before the throne of God interrogatively and then rejects ("Shall I say *Save me from this hour?*"). Most improbable of all is it that He should actually make His first prayer to God a petition

[1] [939 *b*] It may be asked, "If John meant '*why?*' could he not have made his meaning clear by using ἵνα τί, or διὰ τί?" The former he never uses. The latter he always uses with a negative, "Why did ye not bring him?" "Why do ye not understand my speech?" "Why do ye not believe me?" "Why was not this ointment sold?" "Why cannot I follow thee now?" (Jn vii. 45, viii. 43, 46, xii. 5, xiii. 37).

[939 *c*] Moreover anyone who has taken the trouble to construct a Johannine Grammar for himself, or even to give a moderate amount of careful study to his style, must be aware that John does not dislike ambiguity. Perhaps he often thought it preferable to a precision that stereotyped one meaning as certain whereas two or more meanings were possible. A glance at the margin of R.V. will shew that—in spite of John's use of easy words, short sentences, and apparently simple constructions—there are more ambiguities in the Fourth Gospel than in all the Three together.

[939 *d*] Epiphanius (i. 784 D, *Haer.* lxix. 58) is obscure; but, after quoting the words τί εἴπω &c., he says that they are uttered προκαταστευαστικῶς and ἐπαμφιβόλως, and he supplies, before ἀλλά, the words Τοῦτο, φησὶ, εἴπω, apparently meaning "'*Could I possibly say this?*'—says He—'*Nay*, for this cause I came (leg. ἦλθον for ἦλθεν)...'." See the next note.

for Himself and for His own safety ("What ought I to say?" [*Pause for reflection*] "[*I say*], Father, bring me safe out of this hour")—a supposition surely incompatible with the character of Christ, not to speak of the Johannine conception of it[1].

[1] [**940** *a*] Westcott (*ad loc.*) defends the rendering "bring me safe out of the hour," on the ground that ἐκ means "out of". But (*a*) Ps. lix. 1—2 σῶσον ἐκ, ἐξελοῦ ἐκ, ῥῦσαι ἐκ, may mean, not "Bring me safe *out* after I have fallen *in*," but "Save me [*by keeping me*] *out* (of the hands of my enemies who surround me)"; and surely (*b*) Jn xvii. 15, "keep them *out of* (ἐκ) the evil [one]," does not mean that the Apostles were at present "*in*" the "evil (one)". Compare also 2 S. xxii. 4 (Ps. xviii. 3) "saved *from* mine enemies," where LXX has ἐκ, but Luc. ἀπό. (*c*) Westcott's renderings of ἀλλά, as italicized by me in the following sentences: "Bring me safe out of the hour. *Nay, this I need not say: the end is known*," "*Nay, this I cannot say*, for I came to sustain it," would perhaps require ἀλλὰ γάρ: but in any case they are open to the grave objection that they make the Messiah say what *He confesses He* "*need not* or *cannot say*." Even to a modern writer this would seem improbable. Philo—who says (i. 554) "[The Scripture] *does not set down so much as a single noun superfluously*"—might have deemed the suggestion almost blasphemous. John, a Philonian in respect of style, would probably have been of the same opinion.

[**940** *b*] Perhaps John paraphrased the Synoptic "cause-to-pass" by "*save me*", in order to exhibit the absurdity of supposing that *the Saviour*, who came (xii. 47) "*to save the world*," should Himself ask the Father to "*save*" *Him*, on the single occasion on which (up to that time) He had offered up a prayer.

[**940** *c*] The above (**940** *a*) was written before I had seen Dr Chase's demonstration (*The Lord's Prayer*, p. 77) that "the primary distinction between ἐκ and ἀπό, according to which the former applies to dangers already experienced, the latter to dangers which only threaten, is not observed in the LXX." Thus Ps. xxxiii. 19 "to deliver their soul *from* (ἐκ) death and to keep them alive," Ps. lvi. 13 "for thou hast delivered my soul *from* (ἐκ) death," obviously mean "*keep* from dying," not, "*raise* from the dead." So, too, St Paul (2 Cor. i. 10) "who delivered us *from* (R.V. out of) so great a death and will deliver," means deliverance from *falling into* "so great a death"; and the same applies to 1 Thess. i. 10 "who delivereth us *from* (ἐκ) the wrath to come," where Dr Chase (p. 79) justly observes that the preposition points to "the completeness of the deliverance."

[**940** *d*] As regards Jn xvii. 15 "I ask not that thou shouldst take

§ 3. *Some Synoptic divergences, how explicable*

[**941**] In order to understand John's difficulty in disentangling the truth, it will be well to glance at some of the Synoptic divergences in the context, and especially in the last words uttered by Jesus before the arrival of Judas. Italics indicate what Luke omits: capitals, what Luke adopts from Mark.

Mk xiv. 38–43	Mt. xxvi. 41–47	Lk. xxii. 46–47
"'Watch and PRAY, THAT YE COME[1] NOT INTO TEMPTATION. *The spirit truly is willing, but.....*'" [Here follows a second mention of "prayer" and two mentions of coming	"'Watch and PRAY, THAT YE MAY NOT enter INTO TEMPTATION. *The spirit truly is willing, but.....*'" [Here follows a second and different prayer given at full length	"'Stand-up and PRAY, THAT YE MAY NOT enter INTO TEMPTATION.' "While he was still speaking, behold...Judas...."

them *from* (ἐκ) the world but that thou shouldst *keep them from* (ἐκ) the evil [one]," there can hardly be a doubt that John desires to substitute for Matthew's "deliver us from (ἀπό) the evil [one]" a prayer that asks to be *completely kept* from the dominion of "the evil [one]", meaning, "Do not take them completely out of the life of flesh and blood, but keep them completely out of the life of sin...." Compare 1 Jn v. 18 "He...keepeth him, and the evil one toucheth him not." Dr Chase says (p. 111) "The conjecture might be hazarded that in the Gospel and Epistle of St John we have a Johannine form of the clause of the Lord's Prayer under discussion, in which τήρησον or φύλαξον (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 3 φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ) takes the place of ῥῦσαι, and the preposition ἐκ the place of the ἀπό of the Synoptists." I should be disposed to regard this as so probable on general grounds that it hardly needs detailed demonstration.

[1] [**941** *a*] "Come", ἔλθητε, D εἰσέλθητε, Bobb. "that the temptation *pass-by you* (transeat vos)," Macar. p. 53, (a non-Christian is speaking) "that the temptation *may not pass-by us*" (παρέλθῃ, "pass-by", *i.e.* "surpass", "outstrip", "conquer"), the text has "you", ὑμᾶς, but the MS. has ἡμᾶς: and the latter must be right, because the heathen says that the words are "not worthy of a Son of God, nor even of a wise man." Egypt Expl. Report (1899–1900) mentions a papyrus-book in which Christ "seems to apply the words of Matth. xxvi. 41 not to the disciples but to Himself."

Mk. xiv. 38–43	Mt. xxvi. 41–47
to "them"[1].]..."'*The hour hath come. Behold, the Son of man is being delivered up into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going. Behold, he that is delivering me up hath drawn near.*' "And straightway, while he was still speaking, there arriveth Judas...."	as above (932); then a coming to "them", *i.e.* the disciples; then a third prayer and another coming to "the disciples"[1]] "'*Behold, the hour hath drawn near and the Son of man is being delivered up into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going. Behold, he that is delivering me up hath drawn near.*' "And, while he was still speaking, behold, Judas...."

[**942**] With this compare Christ's first words to *all* the disciples on coming to Gethsemane:

Mk xiv. 32	Mt. xxvi. 36	Lk. xxii. 40
"Sit here until I have prayed."	"Sit where ye are until I, having gone away yonder (lit. there), pray."	"Pray not to enter into temptation."

—and Christ's words to the *three* selected disciples, *omitted by Luke* (*who makes no mention of any such selection*).

Mk xiv. 34	Mt. xxvi. 38
"Abide here and watch."	"Abide here and watch with me."

[1] [**941***b*] "*Them*" (Mk), "*the disciples*" (Mt.)—an important difference, for the latter suggests *all* the disciples, whereas "*them*", in Mk, must mean those mentioned in Mk xiv. 33, *i.e.* Peter and his two companions. In Mt. xxvi. 40, "*the disciples*" is defined (by "saith unto Peter") as being the *three* disciples; but confusion might easily arise by omission of the *number*.

How are we to account for Luke's omission of the selection of the three disciples, Peter, James, and John, to whom alone, according to Mark and Matthew, the injunction is addressed to pray that they "might not enter into temptation"? Luke twice repeats the injunction to "pray", but represents it as being addressed to "the disciples" without mention of any selection.

[943] It is quite impossible that the names "Peter, James, and John," could be either inserted by Mark, or omitted by Luke, owing to Hebrew corruption. But, if we can shew that the three Apostles were called by some familiar name in the early Church, this may give us a clue. Now St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians indicates that John and Peter, together with James the Lord's brother, were called "*pillars*"—a name often (**764** *c*) given to Jewish Rabbis—apparently to distinguish them from the other Apostles. But the Hebrew "pillar", when thus applied, may be simply a form of the verb "*stand-upright*". Hence Luke's peculiar phrase (xxii. 46), (lit.) "*standing-up* pray", may have been his way of rendering a tradition that Jesus commanded "*the Pillars*" (*i.e.* James, John, and Peter), to pray. But, again, we have seen that Matthew has—as a second injunction to "the pillars"—"watch *with me*", where Mark omits "*with me*". Now both "*pillars*" (עמודים or עמרים), and "*standing up*" (עמדים), if the final letter is dropped, become עמדי, which means "*with me*".

[944] In Hebrew literature there is a close connection between "*standing upright*" and "*praying*"; and it was a saying of the Jews that "standing", when applied to Abraham and Phinehas, was *the same thing as praying*[1]. Moreover the attitude was the regular Jewish one for prayer, and it certainly does seem unlikely that Jesus would have said to the disciples "*Sit*,...while I pray." "*Sit*", in such a context, would imply,

[1] Schöttg. i. 418.

for a Jew, *an exhortation not to pray*, or, *to delay praying*, as in the Talmud: "The religious anciently used to tarry an hour [*meditating before they began their prayers*]: whence was this? R. Joshua Ben Levi saith, 'It was because the Scripture saith, *Blessed are they who SIT in thy house.*' R. Joshua Ben Levi saith also, 'He that prays ought to tarry an hour after prayers: as it is said, The just shall praise thy name, *the upright shall SIT before thy face*: it is necessary, therefore, that he should stay [*meditating*] an hour before prayers, and an hour after; and the religious anciently used to stay an hour before prayers, an hour they prayed, and an hour they stayed after prayers[1]."

[**945**] That Mark is in error is all the more probable because, whereas he and Matthew have "*Sit until I have prayed*," the parallel (or what appears to be the parallel) in Luke has an exhortation to the disciples, "*Pray*". Mark's error might possibly arise from a confusion of "*sleep*" and "*sit*", of which there are several instances in LXX[2]. If so, he conflated the interrogative "*sleep*" and the imperative "*sit*[3]". But more probably his error is to be explained somewhat paradoxically as an erroneous rendering of "*stand*", in the following manner. The Hebrew "*stand*", עמד, has both (1) a local and (2) a metaphorical meaning. The former (locally) may mean "*stand still*", "*remain* (*where you are*)," i.e. μένω, by which it is rendered in the LXX fourteen times: and, in this sense, it might be paraphrased by Mark as "sit", which, in Greek, often means "remain doing nothing". The latter

[1] [**944** *a*] B. Berac. 32 *b* as transl. by *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. xxiii. 13) quoting Ps. lxxxiv. 4, cxl. 13, where LXX renders "sit" by "dwell", κατοικῶ, and so R.V.

[2] [**945** *a*] 1 S. iii. 2, xix. 9 (comp. Hos. ii. 18). "*Lie down* (*to sleep*)" = שכב, "*sit*" = ישב. In Prov. vi. 10, "*sleep*" is conflated as "*sit*" and "*sleep*".

[3] [**945** *b*] We have seen above (**877**) that the *Acts of John* represents Jesus as *commanding* John to "sleep"; but this appears (**960**) to spring from Greek corruption.

(metaphorically) may mean "*stand your ground*", "*persist*", "*keep on your guard*", "*watch*" (ἐ)γρηγορῶ—by which last word the LXX renders it in Nehemiah[1]. This may account for the difference between Mark (who is followed by Matthew) and the parallel Luke: "(Mk-Mt.) *Watch* (Lk. *Stand up*) and pray that ye enter not into temptation[2]."

[**946**] These various meanings of "*stand*"—combined with what may be called its technical suggestion of "*praying*"—may very well have produced a multitude of Aramaic and Greek glosses. Those, for example, who did not take Luke's view that Jesus commanded the disciples to "*pray*", but thought that He meant them to *remain where they were*, might paraphrase the Hebrew "*stand*" in the margin, by the antithetical Hebrew "*sit*", so as to indicate that the meaning *precluded* "praying". But unfortunately the word "sit" is so similar in many forms to the Hebrew word "*turn* (*away*)", "*return*", or "*repeat*"—the two being constantly confused in LXX—that this gloss would almost certainly originate a number of others about Jesus "*turning away*" (or "*departing*") from the disciples and "*returning*" (or "*coming*") to them; and the same gloss would also facilitate the reception of the erroneous tradition that Jesus "*repeated*" His prayer[3].

---

[1] [**945** *c*] Nehem. vii. 3 (A.V.) "*stand by*", (R.V.) "*stand* [*on guard*]", ἐγρηγορούντων (ℵA γρηγορούντων).

[2] [**945** *d*] Comp. B. Megill. 21 *a* on Deut. ix. 9 "I (lit.) *sat* on the mount," and Deut. x. 10 "I (lit.) *stood* on the mount." (1) One explanation was, that Moses *stood* while learning and *sat* while repeating; (2) another, that he neither *sat* nor *stood*, but "bowed down"; (3) another, that "*sit*" meant "remain" (and so LXX, κατεγινόμην) &c. Rodkinson omits (2).

[3] [**946** *a*] Since שׁוּב, "(*re*)*turn*", means also "*return* (*an answer*)", "*reply*", the sentence "He *turned away* and spake according to the [same] word"—which Mark interprets as "*He* [*Jesus*] *departed* and prayed having said the same word"—might be regarded as meaning "*He made reply* and spake according to the [same] word." But this, coming after a prayer of the Son to the Father, might convey to John the meaning "*He* [*God*] *made reply according to the* [*same*] *word* [*as the prayer of*

[947] Again, if "*stand*" may have two totally distinct meanings, (1) "*be steadfast*" and (2) "*stand up*" or "*rise up*", it is obvious that an ancient precept "*Be steadfast* and pray," when rendered in a later interpretation "*Stand up* (or *rise up*) and pray," might seem to the later interpreter to require an entirely new context. "*Be steadfast*" might be merged in the meaning of watchfulness, and, in that sense, might come appropriately near the beginning of the Agony; but "*stand up*" (or "*rise up*") must come at the very end—just before the arrival of Judas, where indeed Luke places it. Mark, however, has, in the same place, "*Arise, let us be going*"—*without any mention of praying*[1].

[948] Obviously, the attempt to harmonize or explain differences is immensely complicated when we find what seem to have originally been the same words, reported now, not only in different language, but also in different order and context, by the three Evangelists: and it may be impossible now to ascertain the whole truth. Nevertheless a great point is gained if we have been able to shew that there is no reason to suspect Luke's deviation to have been dictated by any doctrinal or ecclesiastical motive—for example, a jealousy of the "pillar" Apostles felt by some of the partisans of St Paul —since it may be explained, at least in one important point, upon the hypothesis of Hebrew corruption. Having made this concession to Luke, we shall be prepared, on equal evidence, to make it to John.

[949] Next, why does Luke omit Christ's second prayer (as given by Matthew), and the statement that He prayed

Jesus]," that is to say, when the Son said "*Glorify*", the Father made reply "I will *glorify*".

[1] [947 *a*] John has (xiv. 31) "*Arise, let us be going* hence," at an earlier point in the narrative. But if the coming of *Judas* is to be regarded as the coming of *one who represents* (Lk. xxii. 53) "*the power of darkness*," then there is a certain degree of parallelism between the Synoptists and John, who says (xiv. 30—31) "*The prince of the world cometh...arise, let us be going hence.*"

twice, or thrice (twice according to Mark, thrice according to Matthew)? The two earlier Evangelists express the repetition by saying that Jesus "prayed *having said the same word.*" The Hebrew language has no exact equivalent of "*the same*"; hence Delitzsch renders the phrase in Mark "*according to those words,*" but in Matthew, not quite consistently, "*according to this word*" (Resch, in his *Logia*, adopting the latter). But the sentence "He prayed having said *according to that word,*" might be a corruption of a sentence in which the italicized clause occurred in the form "*According to thy* (or, *His*) *word*"—a phrase actually found twice in Luke, once as an utterance of Mary the mother of Jesus, and once in the prayer of Simeon; and it occurs repeatedly in the 119th Psalm. Here, too, it would make excellent sense, implying absolute accordance with the divine will, the words "be it" (or "it shall be") being understood. Let us suppose, then, that the Original had "He prayed having said, '*According to thy* (or, *His*) *word*'." This might naturally be paraphrased as "*Thy will be done.*" But it might also be more literally rendered, with a slight corruption of the Hebrew, "He prayed having said *according to his* [*previous*] *word,*" i.e. *saying the same words as before.* Then the two might be combined as in Mark and Matthew. Luke might accept the paraphrase alone, omitting the later tradition about repeating the prayer. If the above explanation is right, Luke's omission is justifiable. In any case it is explicable.

[**950**] Again, "according to thy word"—the verb "to be" being omitted—might be taken affirmatively so as to mean "*it is* according to thy word," *i.e.* "this particular matter rests in thy hands," or "the whole matter, everything, rests with thee," i.e. "*all things are possible* to thee."

[**951**] Another way of interpreting "according to thy word," would be, "as thou sayest", where "as" might be expressed, in Greek, by *καθώς*. Now in Esther vi. 10, "*As* (כאשר) *thou hast said* (דברת)" is rendered, or corrupted

into, "*Thou hast said well* (καλῶς)," and only one MS. preserves the correct "*as* (καθὼς)". And here, in the *Acts of John*, we find Jesus saying—not indeed to God but to the angel or mysterious apparition that tempts Him—"*Thou sayest well* (καλῶς λέγεις)."

[**952**] But if "*according to thy word*" were taken interrogatively, it might mean "*Is it* according to thy word?" or "*If it is* according to thy word," i.e. "*If it is possible.*" This might explain why (1) a highly conflative Gospel, like that of Mark, combines "*if it is* according to thy word" with "*it is* according to thy word," so as to give the two, "*if it is possible ...all things are possible*"; (2) Matthew (less conflative) has only the former of these clauses; (3) Luke, the historian, omits them both.

[**953**] Finally, this hypothesis of an original "*according to thy* (or, *his*) *word*" may throw light on the extraordinary divergence of the Evangelists as to the last words of Jesus before the arrest, where Mark and Matthew speak of the "fulfilling" of "*Scriptures*", or "*Scriptures* of the *Prophets*", Diatess. "*Scriptures which were spoken*", while Luke completely deviates, and John mentions the "fulfilling" of a "*word*" of Jesus[1]. These differences might be explained if "*according to the word*" was paraphrased as "*that the word might be fulfilled*," and if "*word*" was variously interpreted as the "word" of *the Scriptures*, or of *the Prophets*, or of *Jesus*.

[**954**] It happens also that one word for "fulfil", מלא, is identical with the first three letters of "angel", (מלאך, so that indeed מלאכדבר (regard being had to the practical identity of medial and final *caph*) might be translated "fulfilled according to the word" or "an angel hath spoken"[2]—

[1] Jn xviii. 9.

[2] [**954** *a*] Comp. Jn xii. 29 "*An angel hath spoken* to him." Such a tradition might favour the application to Christ of the prophecy of Hosea about the "*angel*" (see **959**).

[**954** *b*] The N. Heb. למא "why?" might also be confused with מלא;

the same letters, דבר, meaning either "*word*" or "*hath spoken*".

[**955**] The last point to be considered is the omission and the insertion, by Mark and Matthew severally, of the following, of which Luke inserts nothing.

Mk. xiv. 35	Mt. om.	Lk. om.
"...that if it is possible there might pass from him the hour[1]."		

Mk. om.	Mt. xxvi. 42	Lk. om.
	"My Father, if this can not possibly pass except I drink it, thy will be done."	

[**956**] It may be taken as highly probable that Mark's "*hour*" is simply a Western paraphrase of the Jewish term "*cup*"[2], and that Mark is giving, in reported or indirect speech, the substance of the difficult words that he gives in the next verse as direct speech. Moreover "*if*", in Hebraic Greek, is frequently used to express a negative. Hence, by transposing "*that*", Mark's words might be made to mean "It is *not* possible that"; and we have seen above (**931** *b*) that

---

so that "there is fulfilled the word," מלא דבר might be read as למא אדבר "why should-I-say?" as in Jn xii. 27.

[1] [**955** *a*] D has, not ἵνα εἰ, but προσηύχετο εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν ἵνα, which might mean, in Hebraic Greek, "He prayed saying, Is it possible that...?"

This, according to a frequent sense of the Hebrew interrogative, might mean, "It is *not* possible."

[2] [**956** *a*] Also "cup", in Jer. Targ. I and II, on Gen. xl. 11 foll., is paraphr. as "vial of wrath", "cup of retribution", "cup of death" (Etheridge, i. 297—300). Here it might be paraphrased as "affliction",= (Levy, *Ch.* ii. 229 *b*) עניותא, easily confused with עתא or עונתא=(*ib.* 226 *a*) "time". In Latin, "tempus", and in Gk, καιρός, sometimes mean "*time of trial*".

Codex D actually transposes "that" so as to leave an opening for rendering the words thus. Lastly, when Greek translators were oscillating between "*if* it is possible" and "it is *not* possible," some might combine the two into "*if not*". By these stages Mark's words might be converted into "*If it is not* possible that there should pass the hour, or cup"—which is very similar to the first part of Matthew's insertion[1].

§ 4. *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the interpolation in Luke, and the Acts of John*

[**957**] The Epistle to the Hebrews says (v. 5—7) "So also Christ was not glorified by himself in being made high priest, but by him who said to him, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*...Who, in the days of his flesh, offered up entreaties and suppliant-prayers to him that was able to save him from death, with strong *crying and tears*, and was heard from [his] godly fear." The Synoptic tradition nowhere mentions "*tears*" as shed by Jesus[2], and though John says that Jesus "wept", it is only at the side of the grave where—far from Himself asking to be saved—He saves Lazarus from death. Whence, then, we must ask, did the writer to the Hebrews derive this too vivid tradition? Was he simply exaggerating in order to heighten pathos? Or was he led by sound Evangelistic tradition, not known to our Evangelists? Or was he misled by prophecy incorporated in some Gospel?

[**958**] The reader will notice that two clauses are italicized in the extract from the Epistle. The first ("*Thou art..... begotten thee*") has been shewn above (**792–7**) to have been probably interpolated in Luke's account of the Baptism from the Psalms. By analogy, we may be prepared to find that the second ("*crying and tears*") was similarly inserted from

[1] Mt. xxvi. 42 "If this cannot possibly pass...."

[2] [**957** *a*] Compare, however, Lk. xix. 41 "He...saw the city and *wept* (ἔκλαυσεν) over it."

Scripture in some Gospel known to the author of the Epistle. Now it is generally recognized that, in Luke's account of the Agony, the words describing an "angel strengthening" Jesus are an interpolation. If therefore we can discover any Scriptural passage, applicable to the Agony, that contains a mention of (1) an "*angel*" and "*strengthening*", and also of (2) "*weeping*", this must appear a highly probable source both of the exaggerated tradition in the Epistle and of the interpolation in the Gospel.

[959] Such a passage occurs in Hosea, describing Jacob as wrestling with the Angel (xii. 3—4) "In his manhood he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him." Here the LXX has "And in his *sufferings* he had strength toward God, and *he had strength with* (μετά) *the angel* and was made powerful: they *wept* and entreated of me." It seems probable here that the LXX means "had strength *with the aid of* [not, *in conflict with*] the angel." In any case the verb, "*had-strength* (ἐνισχύω)", is the same as that used in Luke, so that the coincident mention of an "*angel*" and "*strengthening*" is very remarkable: and the words of the Hebrew text, "He *wept and made supplication*," might originate the "*strong crying and tears*" in the Epistle to the Hebrews[1].

[960] The *Acts of John* says (§ 6) "Again, once when all of us His disciples were sleeping in one house at Gennesaret[2],

[1] [959 *a*] Possibly also Luke's description of Christ's "intense" praying may conceal an allusion to the phrase in Hosea "had strength (or, power) with God." At all events, Delitzsch uses the same Hebrew to render "strengthen" as applied to the angel and "intense" applied to prayer (Lk. xxii. 43 ἐκτενέστερον). This suggests conflation in Lk.

[2] [960 *a*] "In one house at Gennesaret," εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ ἐν ἑνὶ καθευδόντων οἴκῳ. The words "in one house" might possibly be a corruption of the LXX of Hosea xii. 4, which describes the wrestling in (Heb.) "Bethel", (LXX) οικωων. In the *Acts of John*, o and ω are freq. interchanged (*e.g.* (*ib.*) καθευδῶν τω for καθευδοντων), and οικωον might be read as οικωεν, and then corrected to οικωενι.

[960 *b*] "Gennesaret" is rabbinically derived (*Enc. Bib.*) from "garden"

I alone under[1] cover of my cloak (in which I had wrapped myself up) watched what He did. And first I heard Him say, 'John, do thou sleep[2].' And thereupon I feigned sleep. And I saw another like unto Him[3] come down, whom also I heard saying unto my Lord, 'Jesus, those whom thou hast chosen do still not believe in thee.' And my Lord said unto him, 'Thou sayest well, for they are [but] man[4]'." Perverse though this tradition certainly is, it can be shewn to be in part based on facts distorted, and not upon inventions. For example, the command "Do thou sleep" is a perversion of "Dost thou sleep?" Out of this there would naturally rise an explanatory gloss ("he did not sleep but only feigned sleep"): for how could John have seen what he saw had he been really sleeping?

[961] The descending figure conversing with Jesus appears to be the counterpart of the "angel" in Luke. But, instead of "*strengthening*", he seems to tempt our Lord by putting before Him suggestions of failure leading to despair ("Thy disciples, thy chosen ones, still do not believe in thee!"). The tradition is perhaps based upon a parallel drawn by Christian Jews between what Luke calls the

and "prince". The place called Gethsemane by the Synoptists is said by John to have been a "garden": and possibly the *Acts of John* may have been influenced by some Jewish form of the Johannine tradition.

[1] Txt. corr. *ἀπὸ τό* (James suggests *ὑπὸ τῷ*).

[2] [960 *c*] Κάθευδε: Mk xiv. 37 *καθεύδεις;* Lk. xxii. 46 *τί καθεύδετε;* (but D omits *τί*, thus leaving the reader free to take the verb imperatively). See Index II, *καθεύδω*, for illustration of the fact.

[3] [960 *d*] Αὐτόν, an error prob. from taking *αυτο* (*i.e.* *αυτω*) as *αυτο̄* (see 960 *a*).

[4] [960 *e*] "Man", so the MS., but James "men". If we retain the sing., with the MS., the meaning may be illustrated by Ps. ciii. 14, "He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust." Compare also Jerem. xvii. 9 (LXX) "The heart is [deceitfully] deep above all things, and *it is man*, and who can know him? I, the Lord, try the heart" (where the LXX has confused "man" with "sick"). Perhaps the words correspond to Mk xiv. 38 (Mt. xxvi. 41), "The spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak."

"*Agony*" of our Lord in Gethsemane, and the "*wrestling*" of Jacob with an angel in Penuel. According to the Jerusalem Targum, this angel "*Contended* with him [Jacob] in the likeness of a man. And he said, Hast thou not promised to give the tenth of all that is thine?" In other words, it was an angel of the Adversary, or Satan, who accused Jacob of neglecting his duty toward God[1].

[962] St Paul says (2 Cor. xi. 14) "Even Satan transformeth himself into an angel of light"[2]; he also forbids the Galatians to accept a novel Gospel even if he himself or "an angel from heaven" were to preach it. His tacit assumption of the possibility of such transformations makes it easier to understand how the author of the *Acts of John* may have come to suppose that the same Adversary that tempted Christ in the Wilderness and departed from Him—as Luke says (iv. 13) "for a season"—now resumed the Temptation on the night before the Crucifixion. In any case, the statement that the Tempter was "another like unto [our Lord] Himself[3]," and that the trial consisted not in the fear of sufferings and death but in the faithlessness of His disciples (suggesting a fear of their final falling away) must be admitted to shew

[1] [961 *a*] Jacob proceeds to give Levi unto God, as the tithe of his children; and then Michael intervenes in favour of Jacob. Hershon (Rabb. Genes. *ad loc.*) quotes, "The angel was the Prince of Esau, *i.e.* Edom, or Rome." In the book of Job, Satan slanders Job to God; in the Targum, the Angel accuses Jacob to his own conscience, leading him to distrust God. Comp. Zech. iii. 1 (LXX) "And the Lord shewed unto me Jesus (τὸν Ἰησοῦν), the high priest, standing before the face of an angel of the Lord; and the devil stood on his right hand to oppose him." The Hebrew "*Joshua*" would be known to non-Jewish Christians as "*Jesus*". Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* 115–7) regards this "*Jesus*" as the type of the Church, identified with Jesus Christ.

[2] [962 *a*] Wetst. and Schöttg. *ad loc.* give no Rabbinical illustration of this. Eph. vi. 12, "Our *wrestling*...is against the rulers of the darkness of this world," would seem to suggest an allusion to the "wrestling" of Jacob in Penuel.

[3] "(lit.) Another like Him", ἄλλον ὁμοῖον αὐτόν (leg. αὐτῷ, see **960** *d*).

a spiritual recognition of the kind of temptation that would most keenly affect a Prophet or Judge in Israel of the noblest type.

[963] If this explanation is correct, we need not fear to reject, on fair textual evidence, what may be called the ultra-human accounts of the Agony in Gethsemane, as though we were in danger of being biassed by a desire to find in the narrative nothing but what is manly, and noble, and worthy of Christ. No doubt it is true that (as a rule) Gospel statements that seem to tell against Christianity must be accepted as antecedently probable; and what we are disposed to call "unseemly" has a strong claim to be considered true. But in this case, what *we* may think "unseemly" and what may have appeared so to a Greek philosopher of the first century, might not appear so to *Jews and Jewish Christians*. Their tendency would be in the opposite direction. They would be prone to amplify the sufferings of Christ in the flesh, and the outward manifestations of inward and spiritual trials, as demonstrations that He was the suffering Messiah, or that He fulfilled either typical predictions implied by the sacrifice of Isaac or by the wrestling of Jacob, or particular Messianic predictions in the Psalms and the Prophets.

[964] The two opposite views of the Agony represented in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* and the *Acts of John* illustrate the difficulties that must have beset John, or any evangelist at the beginning of the second century, attempting to record the historical facts of the night before the Crucifixion. The Epistle introduces "(?*godly*) *fear*", and "*tears*"[1]. The *Acts of John* omits all mention of trial or trouble. There is no touch of pathos in the *Acts* from first to last. The disciples, in going to sleep, do not fail their Master, nor is it suggested that the sleep is a spiritual slumber. It is taken literally, and *Jesus bids John go to sleep!* Jesus is not disturbed, or pained,

[1] Heb. v. 7, see **957**, and Index II, εὐλάβεια.

by the weakness of the Apostles. He simply remarks "They are [but] man." No prayer is uttered by Him at this point in the strict sense of the term; but, just before His arrest, comes a string of short doxologies and aspirations, to which the only "answer[1]" is from the disciples to whom the Lord says "*Answer* (*ὑπακούετε*) the Amen[2]." Between these two extremes (that of the Epistle and that of the *Acts*) it is almost certain that there was a vast number of more or less untrustworthy accounts composed by those "many" authors who "took in hand"—as Luke tells us—to write accounts of the traditions current about Christ's life. We cannot expect that the latest of the four Evangelists can have been always successful in selecting the exact truth or the closest approximation to it; but since we have hitherto found reason to think that he does not invent but only spiritualizes, we ought to approach with a strong prepossession in his favour the discussion of the Johannine Voice from Heaven, and its relation to historical fact.

§ 5. *The first clauses of "The Lord's Prayer"*

[965] In the attempt to decide between conflicting versions of our Lord's prayer in the hour of trial, an Evangelist at the end of the first century might naturally ask which

[1] [964 *a*] In Heb. v. 7, *εἰσηκούσθη ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*, might be rendered, according to the precedent of the LXX (*εἰσακ.* = (20 times) ענה) "He was *answered*", and this might be taken to refer to the angel sent as an answer to Christ's prayer. There is probably something wrong in the phrase *ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*. Perhaps "fear" and "vision", מורא (or מרא) and מראה, have been confused. See Index II, *εὐλάβεια*.

[2] [964 *b*] The hymn begins *Δόξα σοι, πάτερ*. The disciples answer, "Amen". It continues, *Δόξα σοι, λόγε· δόξα σοι, χάρις. Ἀμήν. Δόξα σοι, πνεῦμα ἅγιον· δόξα σου τῇ δόξῃ. Ἀμήν.* This suggests that the writer had before him the Johannine Prayer, "Father, glorify thy Name," with Greek glosses as to what the Name implied—the *Logos*, or *Word*, *Grace*, the *Holy Spirit*, *Glory* &c. Then these were severally made the objects of a doxology. If the author desired to substitute a doxology for a prayer, it would be easy to read John's *δοξασον* as *δοξασοι*.

version best harmonized with the form of prayer alleged to have been taught by Jesus to His disciples. But Mark records no such form. Matthew and Luke give the opening words of it as follows:

Mt. vi. 9–10	Lk. xi. 2
"Our Father who [art] in the heavens, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done as in heaven so on earth."	"Father, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come."

[966] The following considerations indicate that Luke is probably the closer to the original, and that Matthew's additions are, or were once, explanations. Converts would naturally ask "How is God's name to be *hallowed*?" The answer given by an Evangelist might be, in accordance with Jewish usage, "*upon you*", i.e. *by righteous actions of men on earth, corresponding to the obedience of angels in heaven.* This would be expressed by some such phrase as is frequent in short Jewish prayers (*e.g.* the prayer of Rabbi Eliezer [Berach. 29 *b*]), "*above and below*", "*in heaven and earth*," "*as in heaven so on earth*" &c. But "*as in heaven*", in a Greek MS., would often be indistinguishable from "*who* [art] in heaven[1]"; and these two phrases might be included in the text, along with "*Father*", although the phrase "*our Father in heaven*" is almost unknown, *vocatively*, in the Jewish Prayer Book[2].

[1] [966 *a*] "*As*", ὡς, if written ος (in accordance with the interchange of ο and ω so frequent in the Egyptian papyri, the *Acts of John* (960 *a*), &c.), would be identical with "*who*". Aquila would not write ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ but ὃς ἐν οὐρανῷ (*see* the Fragments of the Book of Kings, ed. Burkitt and Taylor, Cambr. 1897).

[2] [966 *b*] I have found it nowhere, *vocatively*, except in p. 9, "*Our Father who art in heaven*, deal kindly with us for the sake of that great name by which we are called." On the other hand, "O Lord our God, and God of our fathers," "O Lord our God, King of the Universe" &c., occur perhaps hundreds of times. The latter occurs 13 times on a single page (p. 6). In the Talmuds, "*Your* Father, *their* Father in heaven" &c. is frequent; but I have not hitherto noticed "*Our* Father in heaven," in

[967] "*Thy will be done*" might be added in the same way, as an explanation of the "hallowing", and also of "kingdom", so as to indicate that the latter meant a domination, not over regions and habitations, nor over the bodies of men, but over their hearts and wills. Matthew, who in the Sermon on the Mount combines a great number of discourses that Luke separates, would feel no hesitation about including in the Lord's Prayer a clause that he supposed to have been actually used by Him in Gethsemane. The Talmuds record several short forms of prayer taught by Rabbis to their disciples for use in travel and danger[1]; and Luke tells us that John the Baptist prescribed such a form, and that Christ's disciples asked for a similar one—a natural request for missionaries[2]. Hence Luke—perhaps having in view some of these short forms and particularly the Baptist's—might have a special reason for rejecting any amplifying explanations or glosses added to the very brief original prescribed by Christ.

[968] Still it is by no means certain that Luke has preserved our Lord's precise words. It would be more in accordance with Hebrew idiom and with Jewish thought that Jesus should have taught His disciples to pray for God's *active* rather than *passive* aid, in such a clause as "*Hallow thy name*", or at all events in "*Cause thy kingdom to come.*" If "*Hallow thy name*" was the original, it would probably need

---

the *vocative, in prayer*. There is an approach to the vocative, however, in the Jewish Prayer Book, pp. 69—70 (four times) "May it be the will of our Father who is in heaven," and (p. 76) "May the prayers...of all Israel be accepted by their Father who is in heaven." Prof. Eb. Nestlé and Dr Chase have been kind enough to reply (in answer to my appeal to them for information) that they do not know of any early instance of "Our Father in Heaven," used vocatively in prayer, except the one quoted above. The instance quoted by Prof. Nestlé ("Lord's Prayer", *Enc.* 2822) is, I am informed by him, "of late date, being composed by Meir ben Isaac."

[1] J. Berac. iv. 5, B. Berac. 3 *a*, 29 *b*.

[2] Lk. xi. 1.

explanation for Gentiles. Codex D has, in Luke, "Hallowed be thy name *on us*," as in the Jewish Prayer Book[1]: but Marcion must have read "*Be thy Holy Spirit on us*," or something to that effect[2]: and we have seen above (**967**) that "*thy will be done*" was perhaps added by Matthew not only as an actual prayer of Christ but also as explaining "*hallow*" and "*kingdom*".

[**969**] All these variations retain the adjective "*holy*" or the verb "*hallow*". But the famous saying of Isaiah (v. 16) that "God the Holy is *hallowed* in righteousness" is rendered by the LXX "shall be *glorified* in righteousness"; and the doctrine embodied in the Greek version is taught by Christ when He says, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your *good works* and *glorify* your Father who is in heaven," a doctrine repeated by Simeon ben Eliezer—if at least man's "righteousness" is God's "will"—in the words, "When the children of Israel do God's *will*, then *His name is glorified* in the world[3]."

[**970**] Hence an Evangelist would not be departing substantially from the spirit of Christ's prayer, "*Hallow* thy name", if he changed it into a form more intelligible for Greeks and not alien from Jewish thought—"*glorify* thy name". And it is worth noticing that what may be called the Johannine Long Prayer of Christ appears to assume that *God* must be "*glorified*", whereas *men*, and the Logos regarded as man, must be "*hallowed*". This Long Prayer, if

[1] [**968** *a*] Jewish Prayer Book, p. 9 "*Hallow* thy name *upon them that hallow thy name.*" The passive or middle occurs on p. 86 "Magnified and *hallowed* be his great name," or, "*let it* magnify and *hallow itself.*" Of course, if human agency is implied, the passive is used, (*ib.*) "Blessed, praised, and glorified, exalted, extolled...be the name of the Holy One," where the agency of *men* (not of angels) is indicated by the following words, "though he be high above all the *blessings...that are uttered in the world.*"

[2] Tertull. *Marc.* iv. 26 (see **971** (iii)–(iv)).

[3] Mechilta 27 *b*, quoted by Wetst. on Mt. v. 16.

closely examined, will be found to contain a running commentary on Christ's fulfilment of the Lord's Prayer ("hallowed be thy name," "daily bread"[1]: "lead us not into temptation[2]," "deliver us from evil[3]"), in which the Synoptic words are altered, but their sense is retained. The first part of it refers specially to the Apostles, the second part to those who are to believe hereafter, and to the whole Church, including the Apostles; and the special prayer for the Apostles begins and ends thus: "Father, the hour hath come. *Glorify* thy Son that the Son may *glorify thee...Hallow* them in the truth... and in their behalf I *hallow* myself that they also may be *hallowed* in truth[4]."

[**971**] Thus we are led to two conclusions: 1st, that, if an Evangelist were trying to disentangle the actual words of Christ's prayer from a confused mass of tradition, and were to pause in the perplexing process of weighing textual and oral evidence in order to ask himself, "What, after all, would our Lord *be likely* to say in the hour of trial?" he would naturally recur to the words "*Hallow thy name*", *or some Western paraphrase of them*; 2nd, that, among such paraphrases, a very natural and obvious one would be that which rendered "*hallow*" into "*glorify*", as the Greeks rendered it in Isaiah (**969**) "God the Holy shall be *glorified* in righteousness."

[**971** (i)] Dr Chase's work on the Lord's Prayer, which I had not read at the time of writing the preceding para-

[1] Jn xvii. 1—6, the statement that the Son has "*glorified*" the Father and has "*manifested*" *His* "*name*" to mankind is equivalent to "*I have hallowed thy name*": Jn xvii. 8 "The *words* thou gavest to me I have *given* to them," means, "I have *given* them the *bread* of life."

[2] Jn xvii. 12 "I kept them in thy name and guarded [them]," means, "I kept them from being *led into temptation*."

[3] Jn xvii. 15 "But [I ask] that thou *keep them from the evil* [*one*]."

[4] Jn xvii. 1, 2, 17—19.

graphs, contains a most useful collection of facts, which seem to confirm the conclusion that the Original Prayer was nearly as in Luke, that is, without the clauses "*who art in heaven*," "*as in heaven so on earth*," "*thy will be done*," "*deliver us from the evil* [*one*]," some of which may have arisen as conflations, but others as *interpretations of the brief Original*. Thus Gregory of Nyssa (Chase p. 25) says that the same meaning as that of Matthew (about the "kingdom") is "more clearly *interpreted by Luke*" *as a prayer for the Holy Spirit*: for, "Instead of Thy kingdom come, he (Luke) says, *Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us*"; and later on, "Whereas Luke mentions *Holy Spirit*, Matthew uses the name *Kingdom*[1]." Tertullian also, in his *De Oratione* (§ 9), recapitulates the clauses of the Lord's Prayer as *seven* (not *eight*):—(1) "Father", (2) "Name", (3) "Will", (4) "Kingdom", (5) "Bread", (6) "Asking forgiveness", (7) "Protection", which last he connects with "the anxious dread of temptation." To these he has devoted seven sections of comment. To the *eighth* clause he devotes no section, but merely mentions it at the end of his seventh section, appending it as a mere illustration of the seventh clause thus: "To this (? lit. thither) there corresponds (? eo respondet) *the* (or, *a*) *clause that interprets the meaning of* (clausula interpretans quid sit) '*Lead us not into temptation.*' For this is the force of 'But convey (devehe) us from the evil [one][2]'."

[1] Texts and Studies, Vol. I., No. iii., F. H. Chase, Cambr. 1891, quoting "Gregory of Nyssa *de Oratione Dominica* (ed. Krabinger, p. 60)."

[2] [971 (i) *a*] Dr Chase (p. 134) reads (with Oehler) "*Ergo* respondet", and paraphrases thus, "*It is for this reason...that the explanatory clause is added*," but quotes Canon Cook "When he [Tertullian] adds that *the last clause corresponds to this petition and interprets it...*" (the italics are mine). Whichever reading may be adopted, the facts indicate that Tertullian regards (1) "*Lead us not* &c." as a regular clause of the Lord's Prayer on which he must comment at full length, and (2) "*Deliver us*" as an interpretation of it. Both in the *De Oratione* and in the *De Fuga*

[**971** (ii)] The Jewish Prayer Book has (p. 45) "We will hallow thy name *in the world*, even as they hallow it *in the heavens of the height*,...as it is written by the hand of thy prophet (Is. vi. 3) 'And they called one unto the other and said, Holy, Holy, Holy,' &c." (rep. p. 137[1]); (p. 9) "Hallow thy name *upon* (עַל) *them that hallow thy name*, and *hallow thy name in* (-ב) *thy world*"; (p. 37) "Magnified and hallowed be His great name *in the world that He hath created according to His will*"; (p. 9) "Our Father who art in heaven, deal with us kindly for the sake of thy great name that is called *upon us*" (comp. p. 60 "thy great name is called *on us*," p. 59 "thy name is called *on thy city and on thy people*"). These passages, together with many quoted by Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 100), indicate that a Jewish prayer for the hallowing of the Name, or for the fulfilment of the Kingdom, might naturally be defined by a mention of "*on us*", "*on thy world*", "*in the world*", &c., and that, if such a definition were absent from the Original, there would be a tendency to add it. On the other hand, since the Jews generally believed that the

in Persecutione he introduces the latter, either close, or immediately, after the former, with the words "*Hoc est enim*", or "*Hoc est enim* quod sequitur," between the two. By this he appears to mean "*For this is* [*the force of*] *that which follows*," and he implies that the two clauses are identical in essential sense—the latter being added merely to soften the harshness of "*lead us* not into temptation" by explaining that the words really mean "Do not *suffer us to be led* by Satan," or, in other words, "*Deliver us* from [the temptation of] Satan." He has, in effect, said this at the beginning of the section (*De Orat.* § 8) "*Lead us not* into temptation: *that is* (id est) *suffer us not to be led* into it, by him, of course, who tempts [*i.e.* Satan]." Comp. the italicized words in the *De Fuga in Persecutione* (§ 2) "In legitima oratione, cum dicimus ad Patrem, Ne nos inducas in temptationem (quae autem major temptatio quam persecutio?), ab eo illam profitemur accidere a quo veniam ejus deprecamur. Hoc est enim quod sequitur, *Sed erue nos a maligno, id est, ne nos induxeris in temptationem permittendo nos maligno.* Tunc enim eruimur diaboli manibus, cum illi non tradimur in temptationem."

[1] On p. 137, it is preceded by "Thou art holy, and thy name is holy, and holy-ones (קדשים) praise thee daily."

Name was hallowed "on *them*", and *not* on *the Gentiles*, Jesus might expressly omit any such definition, as tending to exclusiveness. Cyprian says (*De Orat.* § 10) "We Christians, when we pray, say Our Father; because He *has begun to be ours, and has ceased to be the Father of the Jews*, who have forsaken Him." May not Jesus have deliberately begun His Prayer with "Father", not "our Father", for the express purpose of avoiding any such inference ("*Our* Father, but *not yours*")? And, for the same reason, may He not have avoided saying "Hallow thy name *on us*" (preferring simply "Hallow thy name") because many Jews were disposed to use the phrase as meaning "*on us, not on the Gentiles*"?

[**971** (iii)] How the clause about "*the Holy Spirit*" may have arisen (as an interpretation) from "*the Name*", may be seen from the renderings in the LXX and the Targums (Pentateuch), of the expressions "I will put, or cause to dwell, *my Name*," on Israel, on the Tabernacle &c. The LXX mostly turns this by "*my name*" (with "call upon", some form of ἐπικαλοῦμαι): but the Targums have "I will cause *my Shechinah* to dwell there." Similarly, in the Gentile Churches, when the converts were taught to believe that the words "Hallow thy Name" (or "Hallowed be thy Name") meant (as Tertullian (§ 3) and Cyprian (§ 12) say) "Hallowed *in us*", it is easy to see that in answer to the question, "How is the Name to be *in us*?" some might reply, "The *Name* means God's Shechinah, His abiding Presence, *i.e.* His *Holy Spirit*." Hence would arise (as a substitute for "Hallowed be (or, hallow) *thy Name* in us") the prayer, "Be thy *Holy Spirit* upon us, or in us." Such an interpretation might be encouraged by the use of the Lord's Prayer in connection with Baptism. "*Hallow thy name upon* these thy baptized children" might very well seem to imply "*Send thy Holy Spirit upon* them." And in some Churches the latter, as being more intelligible, might supplant the former.

[**971** (iv)] But when "*on us*" (or, "*in us*") was transferred

from the margin to the text, or from oral Comment to the oral Prayer, so as to come between the two clauses, thus, "Hallow thy Name *on us* (or, *in us*) cause-to-come thy Kingdom," might it not be taken with the *second* of the clauses (i.e. "*On us* (or, *in us*) cause to come thy Kingdom")? This connection would be supported by a tradition of Luke, which assigns to Jesus the words "The Kingdom of God is *within you*," and also by the frequent Jewish phrase which bids men (**928** (ii) *a*) "take *upon themselves* the Kingdom of Heaven." Hence, leaving the first clause unaltered, some might alter the *second* clause as others had altered the *first*: that is to say, retaining "Hallowed be thy Name," they would alter "Thy kingdom come" into some clause indicating that the kingdom was *in the heart*, e.g. "Send thy Spirit to purify us." This is what Gregory of Nyssa does, substituting a spiritual version for the *second* clause. Marcion, as has been briefly mentioned (**968**), substitutes the spiritual version for the *first* clause; and, not improbably, Tertullian took the same view in his reading of Luke, though not in Matthew.

[**971** (v)] When a marginal clause is incorporated by several Churches, independently of each other, in the text, it is natural that they should differ slightly as to the position of the clause. Hence variation of order in an extant text is a frequent sign of interpolation. This sign is not wanting here in Tertullian's treatment of the clause "Thy will be done," which he repeatedly and expressly places before "Thy Kingdom come", both in his comment on the several clauses and in his recapitulation (1) Father, (2) Name, (3) Will, (4) Kingdom, &c.

[**971** (vi)] In two of the Psalms (ix. 2, xcii. 1), "thy Name", in an address to God, is followed by "*O Most High*", עליון (comp. vii. 17 "the name of the Lord Most High"). This, in the Lord's Prayer, might induce an insertion of "*Most High*" after "name", through feelings of reverence. Indeed *some scribes actually insert "Most High" in another*

Psalm after the words (lxvi. 4) "*They shall sing to thy name.*" If "*Most High*" were added in oral or marginal addition, it would almost certainly be altered by some, who would prefer the expression "*heavenly*". Thus we find, in Daniel (ii. 19), that Theodotion and the Hebrew have "the God *of Heaven*," but LXX "the Lord, *the Most High*"; elsewhere (*ib.* iv. 17) the Hebrew and Theodotion give "*the Most High*", but the LXX "the Lord *of Heaven*[1]." So in the Gospel, some might change "Most High" to "*of heaven*" or "*in heaven*". Others, however, who disliked the appellation "*Most High*" in prayer, but also disliked "*in heaven*" as tending to a localization of God, might avail themselves of the fact that the transposition of a *vaw* changes עליון (regard being had to the identity of medial and final *n* in the first century) to עלינו, i.e. "*on us*"[2]. Conflating these two glosses (1) "*in heaven*", (2) "*on us*", Matthew might naturally think that the meaning was "*in heaven above, and on us below*," i.e. "*in heaven and on earth.*"

[**971** (vii)] The way in which the phrase "*on us*" might be misunderstood and paraphrased away may be illustrated by a tradition quoted by Dalman (*Words of J.*, p. 100, from Sopher. xiv. 12) "May His Kingdom (*i.e.* sovereignty) *on us* (עלינו) *be revealed* (תגלה, from גלה) and manifested," compared with Isaiah (liii. 1) "Who hath believed our report? And the arm of Jehovah—*on whom* (על מי) *hath it been revealed?*" When "reveal", גלה, is used with the preposition

[1] [**971** (vi) *a*] "The *Most High*" is generally preferred by Greek writers, as in 1 Es. viii. 19, 21 where the parallel Ezra (vii. 21, 23) has "*of heaven*". In Sir. xliii. 5 (Heb. txt) "the Lord", LXX has "Lord", but Heb. marg. has "*Most High*", an important fact because it suggests that in Sir. xlviii. 5, and elsewhere, though the Heb. txt. has "Lord" (or "God"), some marginal or textual variation *in the Hebrew* may have induced the LXX to give "*Most High*".

"*Of heaven*" might seem to Greek Christians to encourage a heathen limitation of the Deity to heaven, as distinct from Hades, the sea &c.

[2] The confusions of על as preposition, and as part of the verb עלה "go up", are very frequent in the LXX. See **707** *b*.

"*to*", the latter is always represented in the Bible by the Hebrew אל or -ל (not by על, the word used here). Aquila and Theodotion (or, according to others, Symmachus) render the phrase here "*on whom*". But the LXX has rendered it "*to whom*", and has been followed by John, and several modern authorities[1]. Similarly in the Lord's Prayer, a written or oral gloss "*on us*" might be taken loosely as the dative "*to us*", or "*belonging to us*", and connected with "Father", so as to give the meaning of "*Our* Father".

[**971** (viii)] The result of these additional considerations is to confirm the conclusion that John must have found great difficulty in selecting the best interpretation of the initial words of the Lord's Prayer, and that he and Luke are probably right in rejecting any qualification of the simple word "Father", with which the Prayer begins. For the rest, Luke is probably right in retaining the word "hallowed". But John's "glorify" is more intelligible to the Western Churches—besides the fact that "glory" is also associated by Isaiah (vi. 3) and by modern Jewish Prayers with the celestial "hallowing" of God's name—and it suggests a practical reference to Christ's teaching about "good works" that result in the "glorifying" of the Father in Heaven. As regards John's use of the active ("glorify") instead of the passive ("be hallowed") the former appears more in accordance with Jewish usage in short prayers.

---

[1] [**971** (vii) *a*] Jn xii. 38. In Isaiah, R.V., Ewald, and Cheyne have "*to whom*": and, no doubt, this rendering is favoured by the parallelism "*who hath believed*...and *to whom hath been revealed*"—as though two classes of the blind are being described. Moreover Buhl (153 *a* "mit על") perhaps regards this as one of the Biblical passages where על is used for אל. Gesen. 163 *a* silently refers to Is. xl. 5, liii. 1, 1 S. iii. 7, Is. lvi. 1, in one group, without indicating that in Is. xl. 5, lvi. 1, the verb is used absolutely, whereas in 1 S. iii. 7 it is used with אל. If it is used absolutely here, the meaning is that the glorious power ("arm") of God has not been revealed (by its impress) *on* men's hearts.

§ 6. *John appears closer than the Synoptists to Christ's language about the "cup"*

[**972**] Modern readers of the Gospels may perhaps be unfair to John owing to their very sense of fairness and truthfulness. Realizing in many cases the superior grandeur and nobility of the Johannine conception, and their own immense desire to accept it, and not realizing at all (or very faintly) the desire of early Christians to conform history to prophecy, they may say, "If John's account was true in this or that case, it is inconceivable that it could have been altered and deteriorated into the Synoptic accounts by disciples of Christ. We are, therefore, bound to reject it, and to resist, as a temptation, the desire to accept it. Moreover on some occasions we find John passing over words of Christ that have every appearance of being historical, such as, '*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*' and inserting others of extreme beauty but of extreme doubtfulness. Hence, in general, and in particular as regards the 'cup', we unwillingly adopt the Synoptic version."

[**973**] This criticism urges against the Fourth Gospel two objections, one based on *a priori* grounds, the other on induction. The former is met by reminding the objectors that "inconceivable", as they use it, means "*We* cannot at present conceive": the remedy for which may be that they should attempt to strengthen their power of conceiving by study and thought. As to the latter, I contend that here the argument from induction, on the whole, is in favour of John. In the numerous instances where Luke deviates from Mark, and where John intervenes, John—though extremely bold in his treatment of the letter of tradition—appears mostly to be right in spirit. For example, in the case just mentioned—the omission of the words "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—it may be shewn that, taken by itself, the tradition of Mark and Matthew may have been in the highest degree mis-

leading[1]. Besides, in the particular case now under discussion —*i.e.* Christ's praying at Gethsemane—when critics talk about being bound to "adopt *the Synoptic version*" instead of John's, they are talking of that which has no existence. There is *no* "*Synoptic version*". There are *three* versions, any one of which, taken precisely, is absolutely incompatible with any other.

[**974**] Consequently, the only fair and reasonable course is to come down from the high *a priori* ground, and to argue from the facts of the case, ignoring, for the present, even such obvious considerations as arise from the purity, consistency, and self-devotion, of our Lord's character—putting aside, in fact, all antecedent considerations except the probability that here, as elsewhere, since Luke deviates from Mark, John will intervene to clear up some obscurity or to rectify some error. We proceed, then, to discuss the relations between the Johannine and the Synoptic traditions about the "*cup*", purposing to discuss them simply from a scribal or grammatical point of view[2].

[**975**] A doubt has been indicated above (**931** *e*) whether Mark (as in R.V.) "*Remove this cup from me*," correctly represents the original Hebrew or even the earliest Greek tradition. The proofs of its incorrectness are as follows. The verb παραφέρω, rendered by R.V. "remove", is abundantly used for "*bringing forward*", "*tendering*", "*supplying*", applied to all sorts of objects, e.g. "*bring forward*, or *present* witnesses," "*present* evidence, or letters," "*supply* fuel", "*bring*

[1] [**973** *a*] See Appendix II, **1051–69**. We must bear in mind the Jewish habit of naming portions of Scripture by *the first two or three words of the portion*. This may have led some evangelists to suppose that our Lord quoted *the first words as representing the whole Psalm*. So, if a Latin writer were to say that a dying saint cried out "*Nunc dimittis*", he would not necessarily mean that the saint uttered those precise words and no more, or that he implied mere "dismissal" and had no thought of "peace".

[2] In what follows, the reader should refer to the narratives in English (**931**) or in Greek (**1071**).

stones"; but it is *more especially used of bringing a dish to a guest, and L.S. mention two instances in which it is used of offering or bringing "cups" and a "bowl"*. On the other hand it comparatively seldom means "turn aside", "distort", "twist"; and then, *mostly in the passive*, applied to limbs twisted, or persons, clouds, or vessels, carried out of their course[1]. Matthew himself indicates that he found a difficulty in the word by altering it into "*pass*". We may say "altering" because, if "pass" had been the original ("let this cup *pass*"), so simple a word could hardly have been corrupted, confused, or rejected, by Mark.

[**976**] It is also important to note that the Greek verbal form rendered imperatively might be rendered infinitively[2], so that Luke's words now translated by R.V. "If thou be willing, *remove* this cup," might be rendered, in accordance with the regular meaning of the words in Greek, "If thou

[1] [**975** *a*] See L.S., and Field's *Otium Norv.* on Mk xiv. 36. The latter renders it in Mk "Turn aside, cause (or, suffer) to pass by." But he renders it in Plut. *Vit. Pelop.* ix. "*letting* the remark *pass* without notice," and Dem. *Meid.* (531, 16) "ye *suffered to pass*." In Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 4 (which, he says, "is usually relied on...to prove the sense of '*take away*'") he gives the meaning as "*passing on the dish to the next person*." These are the only instances of the active that Field alleges. In the LXX, it occurs only in Judg. vi. 5 (A) "they *brought-up* their tents," 1 S. xxi. 13 "feigned himself mad (παρεφέρετο)," Ezr. x. 7 "*caused-to-pass* a proclamation in Judah." The active does not occur in N.T. except in this passage. See Index II, παραφέρω.

[2] [**976** *a*] For -ε, substituted for -αι, see Codex A in Mk and Mt. *passim*, e.g. Mk xiv. 19 λυπεῖσθε (for -εῖσθαι), *ib.* 33 ἐκθαμβεῖσθε (for -εῖσθαι). Conversely Mk xiv. 36 (A) παρένεγκαι is for παρένεγκε. In Exod. iv. 6, 7 (Sir. vi. 24) εἰσένεγκον, Codex A has εἰσένεγκαι, meaning εἰσένεγκε, which is the reading of F in Exod. iv. 6. In Mk i. 44, Lk. v. 14, προσένεγκε = Mt. viii. 4 προσένεγκον, Codex L has Mk -αι, Lk. -αι, Mt. -ε. In Mk xiv. 36 and Lk. xxii. 42, d actually has "transferre".

[**976** *b*] In Ps. cxix. 88, "quicken me", the LXX has ζήσομαι. Even if there were no Gk v. r., it would be almost certain that this error arose from Gk corruption, through taking ζῆσόν με (when written ζησῶμε) as though -ε meant -αι: and this conclusion is made practically certain by the reading of ℵ, Ζησομε, and by that of ART, ζησον με.

dost desire *to give* [me] this cup [to drink]." This is followed by the words "Not my will but thine be done," with which words, being supposed by the Synoptists to be adversative, it is connected adversatively (Mk "Remove...*but*...thy will," Mt.-Lk. "*only* thy will"). But these connecting particles may have been added erroneously for the same reason that induced the Synoptists to add "*from me*". Taking these additions away from Luke's text, and rendering παραφέρω ποτήριον as usual, we should have "Father, *if thou dost desire to give* [*me*] *this cup* [*to drink*], not my will but thine be done." This—though not rising quite to the level of the Johannine version, in which the very suggestion of rejecting the cup is dismissed as an impossibility—is at all events entirely different from the Synoptic tradition and much closer to that of John.

[**977**] So far, the argument has proceeded on the supposition that the words "*from me*" were added by Mark, or his archetype, in order to make it clear that the Greek word "*bring*", or "*present*", had here the opposite force, "*remove*". But Mark may not have been so arbitrary as this, and it is possible to shew that he may have been misled by Hebrew. John speaks of the "cup" as "*given*" by the Father: but "*give*" in Hebraic Greek often means "*appoint*", "*ordain*", "*apportion*". The verb "*apportion* (מנה)" is used of "*appointing*" *food*; and the Psalmist speaks of Jehovah as (xvi. 5) "the *portion of* (מנת) mine inheritance and of my *cup*." Now in another Psalm, where the Hebrew text has (lxviii. 23) "*from it* (מנהו)", which is followed by the LXX, the R.V., following unanimous modern authority, has pronounced the authorized text corrupt and has restored, as the true reading, "its *portion* (מנחו)[1]". A similar Hebrew corruption may have here combined with Greek ambiguity to convert a statement of willingness to receive the cup into a prayer that it

[1] Gesen. 584 *b*. The A.V. "in the same", loosely translates the unamended Hebrew. In Ps. lxi. 7, the imperative of this verb, "prepare (מן)", is rendered by the LXX τίς (מי).

might be removed, by converting "cup of *appointment*" into "cup *from me* (New Heb. מיני)."

[978] There are also very early traditions, heretical as well as orthodox, in which Jesus is represented as *seeking* (not avoiding) the "cup", or "baptism", or "fire", which was to try Him. So far as motive is apparent, the heretical traditions indicate a purpose, not to extol our Lord's constancy, but to commend a new kind of baptism; and they exhibit great verbal variations, which suggest that they all spring from an obscure original going back to the first century, differing altogether from the Johannine tradition in letter but agreeing with it in spirit[1].

[1] [978 *a*] Lk. xii. 49—50 "I have come to cast fire on the earth, and what will I if it is already kindled (*τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη*)? But (*δέ*) I have a baptism to be baptized [with], and how am I straitened (*συνέχομαι*) until such time as (*ἕως ὅτου*) it be accomplished!"

[978 *b*] That "*baptism*" may be synonymous with "*cup*" we know from Mk x. 38 "Can ye drink the *cup* that I drink, or be baptized [with] the *baptism* that I am [to be] baptized with?" where the parall. Mt. xx. 22–3 omits "*baptism*", both in the question and in the answer. Mark may have added "*baptism*" as a paraphrase of "*cup*". But there are other possible explanations, from the phrase (Mk xiv. 20) "*dipping* in the dish," or from an original (as in 1 Pet. iv. 12) "*fiery trial*", Delitzsch "*furnace-of* (כור) affliction," confused with כום, "*cup*", or כיר "*wash-basin*", or (without any confusion) paraphrased, first as "*cup*", and then as "*baptism*". In any case, it should be noted that "baptism", "cup", and "fire" are capable of being used as similar metaphors.

[978 *c*] Macarius (Resch iii. p. 351) quotes Luke thus (*Hom.* xxv. 9) "What will I except (*ἤ*) it were already kindled (*ἀνήφθη*)?" and (*De Cust. Cord.* ch. 12) "I could have desired (?) would that it had been already kindled! (*ἠθέλησα εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη*)." Origen quotes it (*Philocal.* xxvii.) "And—what is more—would that it had been lighted! (*καὶ εἴθε δὲ ἐκάη*)." These extraordinary variations as to the "*fire*" prepare us for others as to the "*baptism*", as follows.

[978 *d*] The Marcosian heretics, instead of *δέ*, "*but*" (in "*But* I have a baptism") seem to have found *ἀλλά*, "*but*", and to have read it as *ἄλλο*, "*another*", so as to justify their assertion about a *different* "baptism", thus: (Iren. i. 21. 2, rep. by Epiphan. i. 255 B) "And I have *another* (*ἄλλο*) baptism to be baptized with, and I am in great urgency (*πάνυ ἐπείγομαι*) for it."

[978 *e*] Marcion, quoted by Epiphanius (i. 304), says, in a passage

[**979**] Take more especially the words "*Abba, Father*", which occur here in Mark, and in Mark alone. St Paul has twice preserved the double form (Rom. viii. 15, "Ye received

---

where the punctuation is doubtful, "The Lord, having been baptized (*βαπτισθείς*) by John, said to the disciples, 'I have a baptism to be baptized [with] and *what* (or, *how*) (*τί*) will I [?] if already I have (? would that I had already) accomplished it (*τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη τετέλεκα αὐτό*)': and again, 'I have a cup to drink and *what* (*τί*) will I? I will already fulfil it (*τί θέλω ἤδη πληρώσω αὐτό*)'." (The text is perhaps corrupt.)

[**978** *f*] Elsewhere, in his own person, quoting Luke, Epiphanius has (i. 784 D) "I have a cup to drink and *how* (?) (*τί*) do I hasten (*σπεύδω*) until the time when (*ἕως οὗ*) I shall drink it! And I have a baptism to be baptized [with] and *how* (?) (*τί*, perh., as before, to be rendered "*how*", but perh. "*what*") will I (*θέλω*)! If [only] (*εἰ*) I were already baptized!" The *Pistis Sophia* quotes Lk. xii. 49 twice (p. 189) "*How* I could wish (*quam* velim) it were kindled." The quotation in **978** *d*, "I am in *great* (*πάνυ*) urgency," indicates that the quoter took the meaning to be "*how*", and paraphrased it as "[*how*] *great*". There appears to be a parallelism, or conflation, in Lk. xii. 49—50 "*What*, or *how*, will I!...*how* am I straitened! (*τί...πῶς*)."

[**978** *g*] It will be observed that, in some of these quotations, "*if*" appears to have the force of "*if only!*", "*would that!*" In one of them, Orig. *Philocal.*, "*if only!* (*εἴθε*)" is actually substituted. This may have a bearing on passages where Origen represents the Jew in Celsus as paraphrasing, or quoting, Christ's prayer about "the *cup*" (*Cels.* ii. 24–5) "O Father, *if* (*only*) (*εἰ*) this cup can pass away (*ὦ πάτερ, εἰ δύναται τὸ π. τοῦτο παρελθεῖν*)!" "O Father, *if only* (*εἴθε*) this cup could (*δύναιτο*) pass away!" On the hypothesis that *παρελθεῖν* (see above, **931** *e*, **975**) represented some form of an original Greek *παραφέρω*, "*give*", "*present*", the *Original* of the tradition in Celsus might mean, "If only the cup could be *presented* to me [at once]!"

[**978** *h*] Both in Greek and in Hebrew, the word "*already*"—on which several of the above traditions lay great stress—is one that lends itself easily to variations. When it occurs in the Gospels, SS almost always omits it, but sometimes renders it "behold" (Mt. iii. 10, Lk. iii. 9, Mk viii. 2): SS renders it "*already*" only here (Lk. xii. 49) and Mk xv. 44 (where it follows *εἰ*, as here, *εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε*). In LXX it most freq. occurs in Eccles. where it=כבר. This resembles כדבר, "according to the word," suggested above (**949–54**) as a part of Christ's prayer. But the rarity of כבר makes it unlikely to be substituted for the more common כדבר. If *ἤδη* is corrupt, the corruption is more probably Greek than Hebrew.

not the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, *Abba, Father!*" Gal. iv. 6—7 "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying *Abba, Father!*"). Having regard to the fact that the phrase occurs nowhere in the N.T. except in these three passages, it seems probable that the Apostle is alluding to a tradition about the Prayer in Gethsemane. But, if that is the case, does it seem probable that the phrase was associated in the Apostle's mind with Mark's context, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death," and "All things are possible unto thee: cause to pass this cup from me"? On the contrary, St Paul's use of the phrase far better suits a context expressing, certainly not "fear", and hardly even "sorrow", but rather the fervent devotion of sonship, and confidence—such as we find in John ("For this cause came I, unto this hour"), and in the tradition peculiar to Matthew (xxvi. 53 "Thinkest thou that I am not able to ask of my Father and he will even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?"), and in Luke as quoted above ("I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"). Moreover Mark and Matthew themselves describe Jesus as foreseeing the "cup" as one that He must drink and His disciples also: and all Christ's doctrine, as set forth in the Synoptists, manifests (in spite of an ultimate optimism) a clear foresight of the pain and suffering through which the end must be reached. On the whole, a great mass of evidence, antecedent, collateral, and textual, tends to shew that John is closer than the Synoptists to the spirit of Christ's utterances in the hour of trial, if not to the letter[1].

[1] [979 *a*] In this particular case, it must be remembered that the "letter" of Christ's sayings would be reported with more than usual variations owing to the natural desire to preserve the exact words. Just as the Aramaic *sabachthani* is rendered by D (1054) into Biblical Hebrew, so here, although Mark alone has preserved "*Abba*" as well as "*Father*",

others may have attempted to preserve it and may have failed. An early misunderstanding of the Aramaic "*Abba*", אבא, when combined with the Hebraic "*my Father*", אבי, might easily generate a multitude of glosses, some of which would exactly explain variations in our text, e.g. "*I am able*", "*my Father*", "*If only*", "*If*".

[979 *b*] Note the following similarities:

(*a*) אבא (Jer. Targ. איבא)="*Abba*".

(*b*) אבי=Bib. Heb. "*my father*".

(*c*) אי=N. Heb. (Levy i. 61) (besides other meanings) (1) "*if*", (2) "*not*", (3) "*is*", (4) "*alas*", (5) "*Oh!*"

(*d*) בי=Bib. Heb. "*I pray*", but both in Bib. and in New Heb. it also means "*in me*", and is often erroneously rendered thus by LXX.

(*e*) אבי=(Bib. Heb. rare) "*O that!*"

(*f*) אם="*if*". Owing to the freq. confusion of ם and ב, this is liable to be confused with אב, "*father*". Thus, Judg. xi. 36 "*my father* (אבי)" is conflated by A into *three* phrases, "*my father* (אבי) *if* (אם) *in me* (בי)." In Job xxxiv. 36, Perles (58) would read אם for אבי. In Gen. xliv. 20, Exod. xxi. 15, Lev. xix. 3, Judg. ix. 1, Prov. xiii. 1, "*father* (אב)" and "*mother* (אם)" seem interchanged or confused in some MSS.

(*g*) The New Heb. אי בי, "*it is in me*"="*I am able*", might be conflated with the Bib. Heb. אבי, "*my father*" (Mt. xxvi. 53).

[979 *c*] **Addendum** on (933) Jn xviii. 11. Probably *μή* with 1st pers. subjunctive never means "*nonne?*". But, in dialogue, *μὴ φῶ*, "am I to (lit.) *not-say?*" mostly implies (what is often expressed in later Gk by adding *θέλεις*) "[*Do you wish*] that I *should-not-say*, or, *should-be-precluded-from-saying?*" In practice, the wish, or preclusion, is regarded as so absurd as to be impossible. Hence the expected answer *negatives the wish or preclusion though it may be expressed interrogatively or positively* ("How could I [wish it]?" "[Say it] by all means," &c.). But this construction—in which *μή* falls into the position of *ἀ-* privative—(1) is very rare in the Bible, (2) seems confined to such verbs as *φημί*, *ἀποκρίνομαι*, *οἴομαι* &c., and (3) requires prefatory preparation in the context. [Μὴ *οὐ* occurs freq. in O.T. and N.T. remonstrance, *e.g.* 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, and has been suggested as an emendation for *οὐ μή*: but is it ever used with the subjunctive?]

[979 *d*] Had John meant simply "Shall I not drink?" he might have used *οὐχί* (cf. Jn xi. 9). But the strongest argument for *οὐ μὴ πίω* non-interrogative is its use (934) by the Synoptists as a *statement*. John seems to say, "It *was* a 'statement', but in special circumstances. Peter said, in effect, to the Lord, 'Thou shalt *certainly not* drink it'" (cf. Peter's (Mt. xvi. 22) *οὐ μή*) "and the Lord replied, '*Certainly not* drink my Father's cup!'"

CHAPTER III

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN

§ 1. *The truth negatively*

[980] THE preceding investigations lead to the conclusion that there was on no occasion any objective Voice from Heaven; but possibly on several occasions Christ's prayers were so answered from heaven as to give the disciples an impression of a Word of God or Voice of God sent down from the Father to the Son. If so, such Voices must not be limited to any one occasion (as by John) nor to two (as by the Synoptists). But there may have been some one special occasion, some turning-point for the Apostles in their conceptions of the Messiah, when their Master's doctrine and prayers appeared to them to have received the seal of a celestial utterance. This positive aspect will be considered later on.

[981] If there was some one special Voice of this nature, we may say, negatively, as regards the place, that there is no evidence to shew that it was (**867** *a*) the summit of Mount Tabor (the spot selected by the earliest pilgrims)[1] or Mount Olivet, or Hermon, or any material mountain to which Jesus was "in the habit" of going up for prayer (as the *Acts of*

[1] [**981** *a*] In 1 S. x. 3 "*Tabor* (תבור)" is rendered "*Chosen*", ἐκλεκτός (leg. בחור (Luc.)). *Onomastica S.* (p. 166, and comp. 191) has "θαβωρ (sic), λάκκος, ἐκλεκτός," where λάκκος might arise from a reading ה בור, and ἐκλεκτός from בחור. Was the Mountain first called *the Mount of the Chosen One* (**812–4**)? And then was this transliterated as *Mount Tabor*? Such a corruption might be favoured by Ps. lxxxix. 12 "*Tabor* and Hermon rejoice in thy name."

John says). It might possibly be "the Mountain", in the later Jewish sense of the term, as an abbreviation for "*the Mountain of the House*," i.e. the Temple on earth[1]. Possibly, however, it was a spiritual mountain—like that in our Lord's Temptation only in a different sphere of the spiritual world—the Mountain of the Lord's House, taken as meaning the House of God in heaven. If so, the vision of the Lord's glory, and the hearing of the Voice from heaven, might have taken place on a plain or in a valley, and yet on the Holy Mountain of God to which those who witnessed it were transported by the Spirit. As regards the place, then—the material place—we know nothing.

[**982**] As to the prayer uttered by Jesus before the answer from heaven, we have strong reasons for thinking that it was not in such terms of "*exceeding sorrow*" as to amount to what Mark calls "*amazement*"; nor was it, as the Synoptic texts suggest (though they may not mean it) for His own sake; nor does it appear to have been repeated with such modifications as to convert it from a petition for deliverance into an utterance of resignation.

[1] [**981** *b*] "The Mountain of the House" is said to have meant (*Hor. Hebr.* i. 64–5) strictly speaking, the Court of the Gentiles; and a story is told how (*ib.*) "Rabban Gamaliel, walking in the Court of the Gentiles" [lit. "Mountain of the House"] "saw a heathen woman and blessed concerning her." But the term appears to have been used, apart from this technical meaning, to signify the whole building. Schwab's Index to vol. i. has "Montagne sainte, elle doit inspirer le respect, vol. i., p. 482." When we turn to p. 482 (b. Berachoth, 59^{b}) we find "L'on ne montera sur *la montagne du Temple*, ni avec une canne, ni avec ses souliers, ni avec sa bourse ou ceinture"—words curiously like our Lord's precept to the Twelve; and the literal Hebrew is, not Mountain of the Temple, but "*Mountain of the House.*" Schwab's rendering and paraphrase shew how Greeks—say the author of 2 Pet. i. 18—might call it "*the Holy Mountain*"; and they perhaps explain the LXX version of Isaiah (ii. 2) "the Mountain of the House of the Lord," LXX "the Mountain of the Lord, and the House of God," where the translators may be conflating part of a correct translation ("the Mountain of the Lord") with a paraphrase of the whole ("the House of God").

§ 2. *The truth positively*

[983] As far as we can judge from the Gospels, the burden borne by the Son of man may be described as threefold; first, the sins and sufferings and sorrows of those around Him; 2nd, the failure of the Gospel to touch the hearts of the Chosen People; 3rd, the weakness and worldliness of His own disciples, culminating in the treachery of Judas Iscariot. Under the pressure of these three trials, even when our Lord's lips were silent, His soul—we may well believe—was continually sighing and His eyes looking up to the doors of grace above, while His heart cried *Ephphatha*, "Be opened[1]". He felt "virtue" descending to Him from heaven as well as going out from Him on earth to heal men's miseries. He, too, like Moses and Paul, was cut to the heart by the sight of His countrymen, a crooked and perverse generation, stopping their ears against the truth; but He realised that out of this evil good would come in the end through the unsearchable wisdom of the Father, who hid His deepest truths from the wise and prudent yet revealed them unto babes, and who out of death and corruption brought life and immortality to light. As to the third and severest trial of all—the treachery of one of the Twelve—what precise utterances it may have drawn from Jesus, we cannot feel certain, for Luke deviates from Mark and Matthew, and the Fourth Gospel from all the three[2]; but they agree in leaving the impression that it was

[1] Compare the Oxyr. Logia "My soul is distressed for the sons of men because they are blind in their heart."

[2] [983*a*] Mk xiv. 21 (Mt. xxvi. 24) "The Son of man is indeed to depart as it is written concerning him, but *woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is to be delivered up. It were good for him if that man had not been born.*" Lk. xxii. 22 omits the last sentence, and has, "The Son of man is indeed to go according to that which is determined." Comp. Jn xiii. 3 "He came forth from God and *departeth* to God," Jn xvii. 12 "Not one of them perished *except the son of perishing that the Scripture might be fulfilled.*"

the bitterest drop in His cup of suffering, and that He drank it on the evening before the Crucifixion.

[984] The answer from heaven that came to Jesus when He raised His thoughts to the Father in each of these trials, is variously suggested by the Gospels. When He bore the sins and sorrows of men—of such a one, for example, as the sinful paralytic,—and when men "glorified the God of Israel," doubtless there was "joy in heaven"; and the echo of the joy came down to the Healer as a strengthening recompense for the pain and stress of His soul. Again, when the intellect of the nation had decided against His claims, and the multitude had fallen away, and even the disciples were wavering or deserting, that was the very moment when Peter received a revelation from above, which—whether called a *word*, or a *voice*, or a *thought*, and whether it employed the title of Messiah or Holy One of God or whatever else—at all events resulted in a Confession, which has proved to be a world-pervading fact: and this, we can well believe, came to Jesus as a Voice from the Father in Heaven. On another similar occasion, the contrast between the blindness of the learned and lettered class and the spiritual insight of the poor and lowly, may have caused Him to express His recognition of a spiritual Law, or Will, that triumph shall underlie failure; and when He made answer, "Even so, for so it hath pleased thee," it was to a Voice from Heaven, saying, "It is my will: I have hidden these things from the wise and prudent and have revealed them unto babes[1]."

[985] But there remains the third and most poignant suffering of all. What was the prayer, and what was the answer from heaven, concerning the treachery of Judas? The Synoptists mention no prayer, nothing but a "Woe unto that man!"[2] but we cannot doubt that Jesus felt it as a "woe" *for Himself* and laid it before the Father's throne. From one

[1] Comp. Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21.

[2] See above (**983** *a*) for their several contexts.

point of view the Synoptists seem to surpass John here, in representing our Lord as sorrowing for Judas personally, and not for the sin in the abstract, saying in effect, "I must be delivered up, that indeed is written (or decreed); but alas that one of the Twelve should be the agent!" Mark and Matthew add "*It were good for that man if he had never been born.*" Luke however omits this addition; and it was a common Rabbinical formula[1], expressed in various shapes, one of which may have been inserted here as a gloss, or as a conflation[2].

[**986**] Turning to the Fourth Gospel, are we wrong in thinking that John implies an effort on the part of Christ to reclaim Judas through the washing of feet, when he writes thus, "Having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them to the end"? It is only after this effort has failed that He predicts that one of His own familiar friends will turn against Him; and this is followed by the words "Jesus was *troubled in* [*his*] *spirit*," an addition made by no other Evangelist, but intended by John to express the climax of the Messianic suffering[3]. Then follows the giving of the sop to Judas and the entering of Satan into him[4], and Judas goes

[1] Schöttg. *ad loc.*

[2] [**985** *a*] Conflation might possibly—but only through serious error—arise from the preceding "*Only* (Lk. πλήν) (כי אם) *woe* (הוי) *to him* (לו)." In "*only*" (lit. "*but if*"), "*if*", אם, might be taken as implying a wish, "*if only!*" an occasional Biblical meaning (Gesen. 50): "*to him*", לו, is freq. confused with the rare לו, "*not*" (and the same letters mean "*would that!*"): הוי, "*woe*", might be confused with היה, ἐγενήθη, "*had been born*". Or, "*woe unto him* (הוי לו)" might be taken as New H. הלואי, which (Levy i. 470)=εἴθε, "*would that!*" For לו as לא, see **779** *a*.

[3] See **920**.

[4] [**986** *a*] Luke places the "entering" earlier (Lk. xxii. 3). John seems to suggest that this final effort of Jesus to reclaim Judas, being repelled by the latter, made him the permanent possession of Satan, who before is perhaps supposed to have intermittently visited him. (Jn vi. 70 "one of you is a devil," which is difficult to reconcile with this hypothesis, is perhaps misplaced and based on some misunderstanding: but this question needs separate investigation.)

forth on his errand, and—"it was night". Then come the words "Now hath the Son of man been glorified." How, and why, "*glorified*"? Because, according to John, "*glory*" follows all "*trouble*" that is borne in the spirit of Sonship; and, if there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, there was presumably "*trouble*" in heaven over that one sinner who would not repent; and this, the saddest of all troubles, the Son of God was in that moment enduring.

[987] Afterwards, in the long discourse of praise and prayer uttered by Christ before coming to the place of arrest, Judas is referred to in terms most terrible (Jn xvii. 12), "None of them hath perished *except the son of perishing*, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." For the rest of the Apostles Jesus prays, "Holy Father, keep them in thy name." For Judas He does not pray; and the silence reminds us of the words in the Epistle (1 Jn v. 16) "There is *a sin that is unto death, I say not that thou shouldst pray for that.*" Among the Jews, "*a sin unto death*" meant a sin that demanded the extreme punishment of the Law, *i.e.* death. In John's writings, the words "*sin unto death*", and "*son of perishing*", imply that the sinner is past helping in this world by any forgiveness of the children of God or any prayers of the Son of God. Considering that Jesus "came to save the lost," no words from His lips can be more awful than these about a "*son of perishing*", whom not even He can save, and for whom not even He prays. And there may appear something cold and unfeeling in the sequel, in which Jesus passes on from "the son of perishing" to a prayer for the rest of the disciples, that they with the Son and the Father, may share in the eternal glory of the divine unity and love. It is not coldness, however, but the heat of a fervid trust in the goodness of the Father, whom He calls first "Holy" and then "Righteous" (**894** *a*), upon whom the Son casts, as it were, the burden of the insoluble problem of the origin of evil, in

the spirit of righteous Abraham, "Shall not the judge of all the world do *right*?"

[988] Considered verbally, as we should treat a short-hand report of a modern sermon or prayer, the Johannine Last Discourse must be pronounced so completely non-Synoptic in style that scarcely a phrase can be taken as exactly representing the earliest tradition of our Lord's actual sayings, except in the scattered allusions to the Lord's Prayer. But, judged spiritually—as revealing Christ's deepest of all sorrows, and the still deeper faith and trust that enabled Him, while realizing sin at its worst, and His own failure (which might be called the Father's failure) to heal sin, yet at the same time to retain His perfect trust in the triumphant love and glory of the Father who seemed to fail—this Last Discourse seems to bring us far, far closer to the real Jesus of Nazareth than the words "*Thy will be done!*"

[989] As regards the answer from heaven on the occasion of this third trial, nothing of a supernatural kind is indicated by any Gospel except the interpolated Luke[1]. Doubtless the Evangelists all regarded the prayer as answered; but the answer appeared to them to be conveyed not in a Bath Kol, nor in an angelic visitation, but in the supply of patience and strength for the impending sacrifice. And this view—as the evidence shews—would seem to be the true one about all the answers to Christ's prayers. When enduring men's corrupt infirmities or sinful blindness, or hostile wickedness, His prayer was always the same in spirit, and the answer always an echo to it. The prayer might be expressed generally in Hebrew tradition by saying that Jesus "*prayed to the Name* (*i.e.* to the glory) *of God*" or "*to the Name of glory*" &c.: or the exact words might be given as "*Hallow thy Name*", or "*Glorify thy Name*", or "*Do according to thy*

[1] Lk. xxii. 43-4 "And there appeared unto him an angel...the ground."

word": but in any case the prayer implied, not passive resignation, like that of Hezekiah to the evils of posterity, but an active and filial zeal for the glorifying of the Father, whose answer in each case was of the nature of an "Amen", or "I will".

§ 3. *The truth as seen by John*

[**990**] Towards the conclusion of his Gospel, John tells us that there were "many other signs" done by Jesus that are not written in his book, but that he has made a selection of those which tended to belief: (xx. 31) "But these things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye may have life in his name"; and the Gospel ends thus, "But there are also many other things that Jesus did, as to which, if they continue to be written one by one, I take it that even the universe itself will not contain the books that are continually written."

[**991**] No doubt there is more than one meaning in this, as in most of John's utterances. First, perhaps, the writer wishes to suggest the many-sidedness of Christ's words. They were like light, which no artist can paint. A single ray, passing through a chink and cleaving the darkness, we mortals, children of twilight, may fairly depict; but the light of nature in its natural environment, the light of heaven on earth and sea, no art of man can adequately represent. That painter, perhaps, least inadequately represents it, who adds to a vast power of technical execution a vast sense of the incompetency of all technique, in this particular region of his labour; so that he does not dare to aim at a profane literalness, but lets the ethereal substance pass through his mind, loving and worshipping it, and expressing it as seen or felt by a disciple of light who has become as it were by adoption a veritable child of light.

[**992**] But besides the undoubted bearing of this spiritual truth upon any criticism of the Fourth Gospel, there remains

a literal truth, namely, that by the end of the first century there was a multitude of oral and written traditions, probably a few (written) in Biblical or quasi-Biblical Hebrew, and many more (written or oral) in New Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Among these, the vast majority probably consisted of duplicates, triplicates, or other manifold repetitions, of the same Original—some fairly agreeing in sense though differing in word, but others disagreeing seriously, others again absolutely contradicting one another, so as to necessitate explanatory and harmonizing glosses or Targums, thereby giving rise to new and amplified traditions in which the brief Original was entirely lost.

[**993**] For example, we have seen above that the phrase, (1) "according to his (or "thy") word," if uttered by Jesus in prayer, might be taken as meaning that (2) *Jesus repeated* His prayer, or that (3) *the Father repeated* the words of Jesus in answering that prayer; or, again, they might mean that (4) things are "*possible*" with God; or they might contain some reference to the (5) *fulfilment of the "word" of God* in prophecy, or of (6) *the "word" of Jesus*; or the fulfilment of the word might be confused with (7) *the "speaking" of an "angel"*; or the words might be paraphrased as—or confused with—(8) a saying about God's "*glory*". Here are several (**946** *a*, **949—54**, **1011** *c*) possible ramifications from one stem; and if we add the possibilities arising out of the combinations of one or more of these traditions, and out of different methods of taking each one by itself, *e.g.* interrogatively, or imperatively, or conditionally,—not to speak of corrections dictated by what might appear fit and seemly, or in harmony with the context—it needs no mathematics to perceive that a hundred ample and absolutely different traditions might speedily arise out of a single phrase.

[**994**] The loss of almost all these current Targums, glosses, traditions from the apostles, and traditions from the elders of the generation following the apostles, makes it

extremely difficult for modern readers to understand the position of the author of the Fourth Gospel in the first decad of the second century striving to separate the truth from error. But besides (1) the testimony of Eusebius to the existence of a fair number of early apocryphal works, we have (2) the invaluable testimony of Luke to the existence of "many" writers that had taken in hand to set forth Gospel truth, (3) the testimony of John himself as above quoted, and (4) the following testimony from Papias, which indicates that some time before the middle of the second century, when the Third and Fourth Gospels had been written but had not yet attained the position of authoritative Gospels, a bishop in Asia was discontented—as he well might be—with such written accounts of Christ's life as were recognized to be of apostolic origin, and eagerly resorted to oral tradition.

[**995**] Papias, in language similar to that of Luke and John, but with manifest condemnation, speaks of those who "say the many things," those in whom "the many delighted", in contrast with "those who teach the truth." But he does not go on to protest that he consequently confined himself to the written Gospels. On the contrary he tells us that, whenever he met anyone that had been a follower, or pupil, of the Elders—where "Elders" probably means the generation that succeeded the Apostles—he would ask about the sayings of the Elders, so as to get back to the *oral teaching* of the Apostles ("What *said* Andrew, or Peter, or Philip &c."): "for", he proceeds, "I did not believe I should be profited by the sayings from [the] books so much as by those that came from the voice that lives and abides[1]."

[**996**] This statement throws a flood of light on the position of the writer of the Fourth Gospel. In the first place it indicates a feeling of impatience at "*the many things*"

[1] [**995** *a*] Euseb. iii. 39. 4 (see Enc. 1814 foll.). One MS. omits "the" before "books". If genuine, it means "*the* books (we know)," "*the* books (with which we are familiar in the Church)," &c.

in which "*the many*" took pleasure, and a strong desire to find a path through or past them, back to the living and abiding truth—to the personality or voice of Christ Himself. In the next place it shews the writer's feeling that this could best be done, not through "the books", but through persons. And surely, if he had only Mark and Matthew before him as authoritative Gospels[1], Papias was right in wanting something more. Mark, in spite of occasional graphic touches that really go back to Christ with the fishermen in Galilee, contains many traces of being what may be called "a note-book Gospel", honest, faithful, and literal, but the work of an unintelligent amanuensis, nervously anxious to omit nothing, and carrying to such lengths his anxiety to include every scrap of gloss or marginal comment that his writing is a mass of conflations; and even Papias, though acquitting him of fault, acquits him apologetically: "Mark committed no fault in writing down some things just as he had noted them; for he took thought for one thing [only], not to omit anything that he had heard or to falsify a word in it[2]." Moreover Matthew —except in the Double Tradition which he shares with Luke—is so imbued with the desire of seeing the Prophets fulfilled in the Messiah, that he far too often merges the latter in the former. When we are longing to know what our Lord thought and did and said, he sometimes puts us off with a "that it might be fulfilled", and an extract from Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.

[**997**] Add to all this the fact that Peter is said by Papias to have had—and presumably to have required—Mark as an "*interpreter*", and that Matthew is said to have written his Gospel in Hebrew and that people *interpreted it as best they*

[1] See Appendix VI, **1147**.

[2] [**996** *a*] Euseb. iii. 39. 15. For *οὐδὲν ἥμαρτεν*, "committed no fault", see Enc. "Gospels", 1812 n. 1: and add Macar. p. 29 *οὐδὲν διημάρτησαν*, "committed no serious fault," where the writer is apologizing for the differences between the Evangelic accounts of the crucifixion.

could! What a world of misunderstandings, literalizings, materializings, exaggerations, may be implied in these two statements![1] St Paul is nowhere said to have required an "interpreter". His epistles take us into the midst of the mystery of the "charity" of the Spirit of Christ. But he scarcely ever gives us an utterance of the Saviour. The only one of importance that he records—besides the Institution of the Lord's Supper—is the saying "It is more blessed to give than to receive." This is nowhere written in the Gospels: but it is so beautiful that, had the Evangelists known it as Christ's saying, they could hardly have all omitted it. Perhaps it was a Greek or Pauline attempt to express briefly for the West the teaching of the Lord about the good measure pressed down and running over, which THEY (**738**) will give to those who give to their brother men. It happens that an iambic line pronounces a giver foolish and a receiver fortunate[2]. The Pauline epigram may have aimed at expressing the substance of Christ's teaching so as to supply a retort to some such worldly maxim. If so, it was what we may call a Greek Targum. Certainly it comes from the Lord's Spirit; almost certainly it did not come from His lips.

[**998**] The same conclusion applies to another saying related by Irenaeus as coming from an Elder whom Bishop Lightfoot (very justifiably) identifies with Papias. It is a comment, or Targum, on the Parable of the Sower, and especially on that portion of it which mentions the various gradations of fruitfulness in the seed that brings forth fruit ("thirtyfold, sixtyfold, a hundredfold"). These it explains as different stages in the journey towards perfection: "in my Father's [*kingdom*] are many mansions[3]." Nearly the

[1] [**997** *a*] Schöttgen i. 100 gives an instance of misinterpretation by the interpreter in the very presence of the teacher.

[2] [**997** *b*] Alford (on Acts xx. 35) quotes, from Bengel, "an old poet in Athenaeus viii. 5 *ἀνόητος ὁ διδοὺς εὐτυχὴς δ' ὁ λαμβάνων.*"

[3] Iren. v. 36. 2.

same words occur in the Fourth Gospel[1], and Papias may have heard them from the author of that Gospel, or from one of the author's pupils. It may have been an apostolic explanation of the Parable, or a saying actually uttered by Christ when He explained the Parable "privately", as Mark says, to the disciples. But, in either case, can we wonder that Papias was glad to receive such sayings as these coming from "the living and abiding Voice"?

[999] And can we wonder if the author of the Fourth Gospel felt the same desire? If he did, and if he disliked as unspiritual, and suspected as untrue, a large number of books that were "being written", and some that were already written, about Christ's "mighty works", would not this explain his extraordinary unwillingness—at least it appears unwillingness—that men should go on writing "the things that were *done* by Jesus"? He admits that there were such things; "*many* other things" he calls them. But he does not defer the publication of his own Gospel so as to ascertain and include them, and apparently he hardly wants other people to write about them. The universe, he says—if people go on indefinitely piling up such writings—will be more than filled! Perhaps, in part, he wishes to indicate a sense of his own failure. He had tried to represent the Living Word by a book and had not succeeded. But partly also he appears to suggest that "the books" did not tend to truth or faith. "Books, books, books"—he seems to say—"if they go on increasing, they will smother the Living Voice."

[1000] Concerning the plethora of Stoic writings Epictetus says "It is not maxims that are wanted now; nay, *the books* are full of the Stoic maxims. What then is wanting? The man to practise them[2]." For "Stoic maxims", substitute

[1] Jn xiv. 2 (R.V.) "In my Father's *house* are many mansions (marg. abiding-places)."

[2] Epict. i. 29. 56.

"miracles", "exorcisms", such legends as that of the Gadarene and the two thousand swine, or the withering of the fig-tree—all of them, even if true, only so far useful as they threw light on the personality of the Lord, but probably neither true nor useful; and then we have an insight into the feelings of our Evangelist, who had certainly read Epictetus, and who felt, with him, that *what was wanting in the Church was, not "books", but "the man"*. But he went beyond Epictetus in teaching that "the man", the typical disciple, could be created by the Spirit of God the Father, entering into anyone who had been embraced by the personality of the Son, as revealed in the risen Saviour through the disciples, who are supposed to be represented by "the disciple whom He loved." This, then, this personality of Sonship, was what the Fourth Evangelist desired to portray—discarding all hope or desire of verbal or exact historical accuracy, much more of historical completeness, if only he could make his readers feel the breath of the Spirit of Christ.

§ 4. *The truth as described by John:* (i) *the words*

[**1001**] The Arians are said by Epiphanius to have quoted the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane in order to shew that there was in the Son a will "distinct-and-different (*διηλλαγμένον*)" from that of the Father. Endeavouring to refute this argument, Epiphanius asks, "*How could* (lit. *did*) *He speak* of a will of-His-own contrary to the will of the Father, when He Himself indicates...[1]?" Then he goes on to quote the prayer rejected by Christ as given by John ("Father, save me from this hour") and some of the Johannine context, and, after that, a tradition that he attributes to Luke

[1] [**1001** *a*] Epiph. i. 784 C *πῶς γὰρ ἴδιον βούλημα ἔφη παρὰ τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς βούλημα ὁπότε αὐτὸς σημαίνει πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ὅτι....* The literal "How did He speak" may be expressed by "How should He, or, could He have spoken," "What did He mean [according to your view] by speaking," or "In what way is He proved by you to have spoken?"

(**978***f*), about "hastening to drink the cup" (where Luke mentions, not "*cup*" but "*fire*").

[**1002**] It is highly probable that, as soon as Christian Gospels became subjects of controversy, that is to say some time before the end of the first century, similar arguments and counter-arguments were going on. If so, we may be sure that John would have regarded with sympathy some indignant and interrogatory comment ("*How could He say...?*") similar to the one above-quoted, upon the Synoptic version of the prayer in Gethsemane, protesting against the view that our Lord—differentiating His will for a moment from that of the Father—prayed that the cup, or the hour, might pass from Him, since indeed He was always ready to meet the hour, and since He was always desiring that the Name of the Father might be hallowed and glorified. Such a comment might include contradictions of other erroneous traditions, *e.g.* of the Luke-interpolation about an "angel strengthening" Jesus in Gethsemane: in answer to which, an Evangelist might say that it was *not* "an angel", but "a Voice from Heaven", though "*there are some that say* it was an angel." Then, meeting the objection that "No one heard the Voice or was convinced by it," and also the tradition that it came from a material cloud, like thunder, the Evangelist might teach that, although "*some say* it was thunder," it was not really so. It was—according to his doctrine—*a spiritual voice audible to none but those who had ears to hear it, sent as a last warning to a generation that had ears to hear but would not hear, and eyes to see but they saw not: what they might have seen, and what Jesus saw, was the vision of a great casting out of Satan, a judgment of this world, consequent on the sacrifice of Christ; but they saw nothing of all this, making themselves blind to the Light, so that the Light departed from them.*

[**1003**] Full of such a conception as this, the Targumist or Evangelist might introduce his comment (like Epiphanius)

with an indignant question: "Jesus said in that moment[1] HIS SOUL WAS TROUBLED. *But how could* (or, *why should*) *He say, Father, save me from this hour*[2]*? Nay, for this cause He came, to undergo this hour. But He prayed to the Glory of the Name. Therefore there came a Voice from Heaven that the Lord would glorify it. Now some say that it* [i.e. the Voice] *was thunder; others, that an angel spake unto Him. But that Voice had not come for the sake of Jesus, but for the sake of the multitude. For in that moment there was a judgment of this world, and in that moment* [*it was decreed that*] *the Ruler of this world should be cast out: because He was to draw all men unto Him when He was lifted up*[3]*—that is to say, lifted up on the Cross, by which death He was to die.*"

[1] [**1003** *a*] "In that moment", *i.e.* in that critical moment. This might mean either that moment of stress and strain when He was overcoming Satan, or the moment when He was receiving some special revelation. It corresponds to the parallel Lk. x. 21 "*in that hour*" (Mt. xi. 25 "*in that season*") in the context of which Jesus sees "*Satan fallen from heaven.*" For the parallelism see **921–3**.

The phrase "*in that moment*", "*in that hour*", "*in that season*", or "*then*", might easily be transferred from "*said*" to the verb following it, i.e. "*is troubled*" or "*is exceeding sorrowful*". In that case it would become, in direct speech of the first person, *now* ("*Now* is my soul troubled"). Matthew has (xxvi. 38) "*Then he saith* unto them, Exceeding sorrowful is my soul."

[2] [**1003** *b*] "Save me from this hour." If the Targumist had been referring *verbatim* to the prayer as recorded by the three Evangelists, he would have used the word "*cup*", not "*hour*", and would not have used the verb "save" (but "pass" or "cause to pass"). But, (1) as we have seen, Mark (**956**) conflates "*cup*" with "*hour*", and the latter was more intelligible to the Gentile sections of the Church; (2) the Synoptists are themselves at variance with one another as to the verb used with "cup"; (3) it might well seem to the Targumist inexpedient to quote *the exact words* assigned to Christ by ancient and authoritative Evangelists and to represent Him as exclaiming, in effect, "*How could I use those words?*"; (4) point is gained by a paraphrase that represents the "*Saviour*" as saying, in effect, "How could I, [*the Saviour*], possibly pray to *be saved*?".

[3] [**1003** *c*] "Lifted up" (N. Heb. זקף)="*hanged*", "*crucified*": Levy i. 549 *b* "einen Gehängten".

[**1004**] Let us suppose that an Evangelist had in his mind an oral or written comment of this nature (on the one Prayer of Jesus recorded by the written Gospels current in his day) and that he wished to incorporate it in his Gospel. The first question for him would be at what precise point or crisis in the Saviour's life the Prayer should be placed. Mark placed it on the night before the Crucifixion, after the words "My soul is exceeding sorrowful." John places it after similar *words*, "My soul is troubled." But why did he not assign it to the same *time* and *place* (Gethsemane)? The answer seems to be found, partly, in the much longer prayer, mingled with praise, which John places just before the arrest. This, following, at a considerable distance, the climax of trouble ("he was troubled in spirit"), exhibits Jesus as being now in such an exalted atmosphere of peace and harmony that He could not—even in a rejecting negative—put before Himself the thought of asking to be "saved from this hour".

[**1005**] In other words, John regards that second and longer prayer, of which the first petition is, "Father,...glorify thy *Son*," as being a higher revelation (given to the disciples alone) than that given to the multitude in the words, "Father, glorify thy *Name*." The "Name" was a rudimentary term, suited to the Old Jerusalem, that is, to the Jews, some of whom taught that no blessing was worthy to be so called unless it mentioned the "Name" or the "Kingdom"[1]: the "Son" was a cosmopolitan term, for the Universal Church, the New Jerusalem. The inferior and Jewish prayer, "Glorify thy Name", was followed by an inferior and Jewish sign, the Bath Kol, which convinced none that were not already convinced, and which was misheard by the multitude. The higher and cosmopolitan prayer was followed by no Bath Kol, nor by any audible answer of *words*, but by an *act*,

[1] [**1005** *a*] See B. Berach. 12 *b*, 40 *b*. "Rab said, No blessing in which mention is not made of the NAME is a blessing....R. Jochanan said, No blessing in which there is not the KINGDOM is a blessing."

or rather by a state of mind and a course of action indicated by Christ's going forth to meet His captors, with the words "I am he", and, "*If then ye seek me, let these go.*"

[**1006**] It is possible that John was deceived in supposing that these last words[1] were ever uttered: but his conception of our Lord's final self-preparation in prayer—and prayer not for Himself but for others—followed by an immediate *act*, not for Himself but for others, is at all events probably closer than the Synoptic view to the original text of the Gospel, and far closer to the character of Christ. When a child of God sends up words of prayer to the Father, can we conceive of a better answer that He can send down from Heaven than spiritual strength to convert the words into their corresponding deeds?

[**1007**] Carrying out, then, this conception, and at the same time exactly following the letter of an old Synoptic tradition about "*assuredly not drinking* (the cup)"—the only one indeed recorded by the three Synoptists in parallel passages—John may have decided that his predecessors had misunderstood the words "I will assuredly not drink (the cup)," and also those which referred to (what they called) the "*removal* of the cup." The latter were to be taken, according to John, as meaning "*the presentation*" of the cup—"The cup that the Father *presents* to me." The former, though in appearance negative, were to be taken as equivalent to an affirmation, coming after the statement that the Father gave Him the cup: "The Father gives me the cup, and I—if I am to be guided by you my disciples—am not to drink it!".

[**1008**] As regards one of these two points, the "presentation", we have given reasons for thinking that John is right and the Synoptists wrong. As regards the other, the "not

[1] [**1006** *a*] See Appendix II, indicating the ambiguities of the Hebrew and Greek words signifying "let go", "pardon", "suffer", "abandon", and the various evangelic traditions that appear to have arisen from this origin.

drinking", the reasons are not so strong, but still they are strong: and to their intrinsic strength must be added the extrinsic support derived from John's correctness on the first point. On the whole, our wishes may be honestly and logically accompanied by our convictions that John is right on both points. In any case, what may be called the *active* part of the Synoptic prayer ("remove the cup") appears to be placed—in some form—by John *where the Synoptists place it*, i.e. *at Gethsemane, but not in the form of a prayer.*

[**1009**] Now we have to deal with the *passive* part of the Synoptic prayer, which, though recorded in different versions with perplexing variations and appearances of confusion, certainly leaves on the reader the impression that it is an utterance of sorrowful resignation. The question for John was, which of the Synoptic versions was to be favoured, and where this prayer, or some version of it, was to be placed.

[**1010**] First, as to the wording of the prayer, we have found (**931** *h*) that Mark (xiv. 36), correctly rendered, *seems not to record a prayer*, but a *statement*, namely, that the Son could not for a moment put His will beside that of the Father, or ask which of the two was to be done ("[It is] not [the question] what I will but what thou"). Greek grammar, and the character of Christ, alike point to this conclusion as almost certain[1]. Less certain, but highly probable (because

[1] [**1010** *a*] It is worth while noting that (1) there is a Greek verbal similarity between Mk xiv. 36 "what *I* (ἐγὼ) (emph.) will" (which might be rendered "What will *I*") and Lk. xii. 49 "What will I" (in "*What will I* if it is already kindled?"), the only difference being that Mk inserts "I" for emphasis. (2) Both Mk and Lk. assign these words to Christ. (3) Mk connects them with a "*cup*", and Lk. with a "*fire*"; but it has been shewn (**978** *b*) that "*fire*" and "*cup*" imply similar metaphors, might be confused in Hebrew, and are actually (**1001**) interchanged by Epiphanius.

[**1010** *b*] Suppose the meaning of Mk xiv. 36 to have been, originally, "What do I pray except [the prayer, Be it] according to thy word?" This, in an early Gk translation, might be paraphrased, "*What* will I, except that which thou wilt?" τί ἐγὼ θέλω πλὴν ὃ σὺ [θέλεις]—retaining the

it harmonizes with and explains a number of perplexing Synoptic variations) is the view that Christ's prayer was

Hebraic negative interrogative, so that the meaning really was, "*I do not will* except that which thou wilt."

[**1010** *c*] "*What*" being here equivalent to "*not*", the latter might be written over the former in the Greek text to express its meaning. A conflative Evangelist, combining the two, might produce "*Not what* will I," *οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω*. Then, for parallelism and consistency, he, or a subsequent editor, might alter *ὅ* into *τί* and *πλήν* into *ἀλλά*, thus creating Mk's present text, *οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ*, "[It is] not [the question] what will I but what [wilt] thou." This hypothesis *would explain Matthew's and Luke's agreement in reading* πλήν (*against Mark's* ἀλλά): *they may have been adhering to the earliest Greek tradition.* It would also explain (besides Mark's rather astonishing Greek) Matthew's and Luke's further alterations, as endeavours to extricate the sense from the obscurities into which Mark had brought it.

[**1010** *d*] That early confusion existed as to the interpretation of the interrogative "*What?*", "*Why?*", or "*How?*" in Christ's utterance about the "*cup*", or "*fire*", or "*baptism*", appears from the following variants given more fully above (**978** *a–g*):

(1) Lk. xii. 49–50 "*What will I...how am I straitened* (*τί θέλω...πῶς συνέχομαι*)," Pistis Sophia (189) "*how I could wish...how shall I endure* (*ἀνέξω*)."

(2) Macarius (**978** *c*) "*What* will I except," "*I could have desired would that...*," Orig. "*And what is more* (*δὲ*) *would that....*"

(3) The Marcosians (**978** *d*) "I have *another* (*ἄλλο* for *ἀλλά*) baptism": Iren. and Epiph. "I am in *great* urgency (*πάνυ ἐπείγομαι*) for it," where "*great*" seems a paraphrase of "*how*".

(4) Marcion (**978** *e*) "*What* (or, *how*) will I if already I have accomplished it."

(5) Epiphanius (**978** *f*) "*How* (?) do I hasten (*τί σπεύδω*)...*how* (or, *what*) will I."

[**1010** *e*] The variations "*hasten*", "*in urgency*", "*constrained*", may be illustrated by Jerem. (xvii. 16) "*hasten* (**אצתי**)", LXX *ἐκοπίασα*, Aq. *ἐκραταίωσα*, S. *ἠπείχθην* (v.r. *εἰπείχθην*, *ἠπείλθην*), Syriac (Field Hex.) "prohibebar (*ἐπεσχόμην*)". Hesychius says that *ἐπειχθῶμεν* = *σπουδάσωμεν*, "let us take pains." But Dan. Bel. 30 (Theod.) *ἐπείγουσιν αὐτόν* (LXX *ἐπισυνήχθη ὁ ὄχλος...ἐπ' αὐτόν*) "*throng* him", "*press* him", shews that *ἐπείγομαι might be taken to mean* "*I am pressed*" *when it really means* "*I press on*". The same ambiguity might arise (1) from the Heb. **אוץ** (in Jerem. xvii. 16) which (Buhl 19 *b*) in Bib. Heb. means *both* "*press*" *and* "*hasten*", but in New Heb. appears (*ib.* and Levy i. 69 *b*) to mean only "*press*" (especially of *pressing* grapes &c.); or (2) from **חוש**,

"*According to thy word*," but that the Church at large "interpreted" the brief and obscure phrase—to quote the saying of Papias about Matthew's Gospel—"as each man best was able," the result being a host of unhistorical traditions enumerated above. It was also pointed out that although these words, in the form "Thy will be done," had found their way into Matthew's version of what we habitually call "the Lord's Prayer", this clause had been rejected by Luke.

[**1011**] Under these circumstances, what course was John to adopt in the wording of Christ's short prayer? If he had followed Mark, he would have abolished the prayer, replacing it by a statement. Had he followed Matthew and Luke, he would have contradicted, or seemed to contradict, the conviction that the will of the Father was *at all times* the food and object of the Son's existence so that He could never speak of it passively but actively, a conviction that his Gospel repeatedly expresses[1]. If he had followed neither, but had retained a mention of "*will*", in an active version of the clause, e.g. "*Accomplish thy will*" (a form in use among the Jews[2]), he would have challenged a direct comparison between himself and the Synoptists, which, as a rule, he avoids. More-

which in Bib. Heb. means "*hasten*", but in New Heb. (Levy *Ch.* i. 245 *b*) "*grieved*", "*cut to the heart.*"

[**1010** *f*] In view of all these variations, it is possible that Jn xii. 27 "*Why* (or, *how*) should I say," τί εἴπω, may be a version of "*What* will I" *i.e.* "*What* do I pray for?" taken as meaning "*Why* should I say [in prayer]?"

[1] [**1011** *a*] Here is John's first mention of God's *will*, (iv. 34) "This is my *food*, that I do the *will* of him that sent me"; and this is the second, (v. 30) "I *seek* not mine own will but the *will* of him that sent me," and this, the third, (vi. 38) "Not that I should do my own will but the *will* of him that sent me." In all these cases Christ is speaking.

[2] [**1011** *b*] Such was the prayer of the great Rabbi Eliezer (B. Berac. 29 *b*) "*Do thy will in heaven above*, and give contentment (Wetst. *quietem* (נחת) *spiritus*) to those who fear thee below, and do that which is good in thine eyes."

over, if the original did not contain the word "*will*", there was no textual reason why he should retain it. These being the facts (according to our hypothesis), John might naturally adopt a paraphrase (which may have occurred to others also) expressing "According to thy word" as though it were "according to thy *glorious* will, or, thy *glorious* name"—in accordance with a frequent custom of Targums, to add the epithet of "*glorious*" to the Name of God, or to substitute "*glory*" for "*God*". This paraphrase he may have taken as having an active meaning, "*Do according to thy glory*, or, *according to thy glorious name*." And then, having regard to the first clause of the Lord's Prayer, "*Hallowed be thy name*," and to the essential meaning of the words, *i.e.* "Make thy name glorious in us with the glory of righteousness" (according to the words of Isaiah in the LXX (**969**) "*glorified* in righteousness"), he may have finally adopted, as his version of the prayer, the words "*Glorify thy name*"[1].

§ 5. *The truth as described by John:* (ii) *the time*

[**1012**] And now, Gethsemane being—from John's point of view (**1004**)—out of the question as the place for this short prayer, what suitable place and what suitable occasion could he assign to it? In order to answer this question let us go back to the Targum above suggested as being in his mind (**1003**), and, turning its initial words ("Jesus said at that moment His soul was troubled") from the third into the first person ("Jesus said, 'At this moment my soul is troubled'"), let us note how easily some of the following words might be taken in the same way, as direct speech, uttered by our Lord Himself, and some as a narrative of what happened: "Jesus

[1] [1011 *c*] It happens also that "thy glory", כבדך or כבודך, somewhat resembles "according to thy word," כדברך, and perhaps this should have been mentioned above (**949–54**) as a possible cause of corruption.

said, '*At this moment is my soul troubled. But how could* (or, *why should*) *I say, Father, save me from this hour? Nay, for this cause I came, to undergo this hour. To the glory of thy Name!' Therefore there came a Voice from Heaven* '*I* [*have glorified and*] *will glorify it*'.' *Now some said*[2] *that it was thunder; others, that an angel spake unto Him.* But He said, '*That Voice came not for my sake but for yours. For in this moment is the judgment of this world, in this moment* [it is decreed that] *the Ruler of this world shall be cast out: for I will draw all men unto me when I am lifted up*'—*By this He meant the death that He was to die.*"

[**1013**] Comparing this result with John's text, we shall find that the two do not differ except in quite insignificant details: and the rest of John's dialogue (xii. 34—36) between Jesus and the multitude might easily spring from the same origin, namely from a comment on the blindness of the multitude to Christ's conception of "glory", and on their final failure to grasp His doctrine that the "glorifying" of the Son of man would consist in His being exalted (or "uplifted") by an act of sacrifice. The end was that the Light of the world departed from them and "*was hidden*". This John expresses as a literal act—as though Jesus finally departed from the Temple, or from the Jews, and thus (xii. 36) "*was hidden* (ἐκρύβη)"—but no one has satisfactorily explained "*was hidden*", except as being used strangely and unnaturally in a literal meaning, so as to suggest a natural and spiritual one[3]. The crisis, then, contemplated by

[1] For the reduplication, see **915**.

[2] "*Some said*", a misinterpretation of "*some say*": see **874**.

[3] [**1013** *a*] Comp. Jn viii. 59 (R.V.) "But Jesus hid himself (marg. "*was hidden*") (ἐκρύβη) and went out of the temple," where Westcott has no note on "*hidden*". Here (xii. 36) his note is, "The hiding was not His work but the work of His adversaries, as being the result of their want of faith." The words ought to be regarded as parallel to Christ's final appeal to Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 42) "If [only] thou hadst known...the things pertaining to peace! But as it is, *they have been hidden* (ἐκρύβη)

our hypothetical Targumist or Evangelist, and by John (whom we suppose to be his interpreter), is what St Paul calls the "stumbling" or "hardening" of Israel, but what Isaiah calls also their "blinding": and this may be regarded as mainly, if not entirely, producing Christ's "trouble of soul" mentioned in the context.

[**1014**] But the "hardening" of Israel is connected in St Paul's writings[1] with the "*coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles*": and it may be taken as highly probable or certain that the two would be similarly connected by our Evangelist in thought if not in word. Now it has been shewn above (**921–3**) that the "*coming in*" *of the Gentiles* appears to be predicted (though obscurely) in the passage of Luke describing the return of the Seventy and the response of Jesus to the Spirit; when He acknowledges the will of the Father in hiding the truth from "the wise" (*i.e.* the higher classes of Jews) and in revealing it to "*babes*" (*i.e.* the poorer Jews and the Gentiles[2])—as though this were a triumph over "Satan" whom He "beheld fallen as lightning from heaven."

[**1015**] John also connects the two. But he so utterly differs from Luke in word—having nothing in common verbally or even semi-verbally except (John) the "casting out of the Ruler of this world" and (Luke) "Satan fallen from heaven"—that it is easy to overlook the identity of the connection. Luke, the quasi-historian, mentions a class (probably non-existent in fact[3]), the "Seventy" Missionaries to the Gentiles: John, the poet, personifies the class in

from thine eyes." What Luke represents Christ as *saying*, John represents Him as *doing*; and Luke's "things pertaining to peace" are personified in John's "Jesus" (the Prince of Peace).

[1] Rom. xi. 11, 25.

[2] If these words (Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21) were uttered by Christ before the Resurrection, they would probably refer to the Jews alone directly, and would only refer to the Gentiles by implication, in so far as His Gospel was essentially universal.

[3] See *Clue* (**233–5**).

"Philip", presumably the Apostle, but confused in the earliest days of the Church with Philip the Evangelist, who is said to be "usually reckoned as one of the Seventy[1]," and, if so,

[1] [**1015** *a*] "Usually...Seventy", so *Enc. B.* 3701 *a*, and comp. Hippol. "On the Seventy", Clark, p. 132. The early confusion between the two Philips (if we are to assume that there were two) and the fact that one Philip was specially appointed as a minister to the "*Hellenists*", might favour the development of a tradition that he was foremost in bringing the "*Greeks*" to Jesus.

[**1015** *b*] There may possibly be some connection between Luke's tradition about (Lk. x. 1) the *Seventy*, mentioned only in his Gospel, and Luke's tradition about the *Seven* Ministers to the Hellenists, recorded only in Acts (vi. 5). In Hebrew, שבע="*seven*", and the plural of this, שבעים="*seventy*". Again, the "*Hellenists*" might be taken as meaning all the nations of the Roman Empire that spoke Greek, i.e. *the Gentiles* generally as distinct from the Jews. Thus a statement that the Lord, besides first appointing Twelve to minister to the twelve tribes of Israel, ordained (after His resurrection) that there should be *Seven to minister to the Hellenists*, might easily originate a tradition that the Lord ordained *Seventy* to minister to the *Gentiles*, and it may have been assumed that He did this before His resurrection. Whether these "*Seven*" have any connection with the ministration of the "*seven* loaves" and the few fishes to the Four Thousand (in which "*seven*" baskets of fragments are picked up, whereas "twelve" baskets are gathered in the miracle of the Five Thousand) and whether John's *Seven* (who partake (xxi. 2) of bread and fishes with the Lord after His resurrection) have any further bearing on Luke's misunderstanding about the *Seventy*, are questions that can only be raised, not discussed here.

[**1015** *c*] Greek corruption might also confirm Luke in his error about the Seventy. It happens that the second of the Seven was called Philip (commonly known as "the Evangelist"), the first being Stephen. Immediately after Stephen's martyrdom, a "Philip" is described as making a multitude of converts in Samaria. He is commonly supposed to be Philip *the Evangelist*, i.e. of the *Seven*. But some very early authorities say it was Philip *the Apostle*, i.e. of the *Twelve*: and the same division of opinion occurs in other passages where "Philip" is mentioned. Elsewhere Acts has (xxi. 8) "Philip the Evangelist, *being of the* (ὄντος ἐκ τῶν) *Seven*," and similarly (for the purpose of distinction) writes Polycrates, as quoted by Eusebius (iii. 31. 3) (Heinichen) "Philip *of the Twelve Apostles*, Φ. τῶν δ. ἀποστ." (v.r. ὄντα τῶν, Schwegl. τὸν τῶν, but suggests ὁ τῶν). Now, owing to the freq. interchange of ω and ο, "of the apostles" might be written τοαποστολων. When ω was written above ō to indicate the correct spelling, it would be an easy error to

probably as their leader. According to the Fourth Gospel, first Philip approaches Andrew. Then the two Apostles—the only members of the Twelve that have Greek names[1]—

suppose that ω was not to be substituted but to be *inserted.* This might give τωῦαποστολων, read as τῶν ὁ' ἀποστόλων, that is, "*of the Seventy Apostles.*"

[**1015** *d*] Legend, springing from prophecy, apparently connected itself at a very early date with Philip, whom Luke describes (after his conversion of Samaria) as being told by "an angel" (Acts viii. 26–40) to go "to (κατὰ) the *South* (lit. *noonday*) to *Gaza, this is desert(ed)*...the Spirit *snatched* (ἥρπασεν) Philip...he was found in *Azotus.*" The clause "*this is desert*" is very perplexing. It has been explained as a gloss from Strabo xvi. 30: but perhaps (Index II, "Gaza") some ancient Christian writer saw in Philip's missionary conquest of the Philistian coast a fulfilment of Zephaniah (ii. 4–5) "*Gaza* shall be *forsaken* (LXX "*snatched* (as a prey)," διηρπασμένη)...they shall drive out *Ashdod* (LXX, *Azotus*) *at the noonday* (μεσημβρίας)...*the word of the Lord is against you* (ἐφ' ὑμᾶς)...*land of the Philistines.*" Luke seems to have found some obscure tradition based on Zephaniah, conflating "*Gaza* is *forsaken*" with "*snatched away* [from Gaza]" and carried to "*Azotus*", and taking "*noon-day*" as "*South*". The last words of the prophecy ["the word... Philistines"] correspond to Luke's prosaic account of Philip, who (Acts viii. 40) "was found in *Azotus* and *passing through* [the coast] *preached to all the cities* until he came to Caesarea," *i.e.* all the cities on the coast of Philistia. As regards "*against you*"—conquest by the *sword* in O.T. corresponding to conquest by the *Gospel* in N.T.—see **1018**.

[1] [**1015** *e*] The tradition of the approach of the Greeks through Philip and Andrew might be facilitated by a misunderstanding of some personification or metaphor playing upon the names of the two Apostles, partly because they were Greek names, and partly because "Andrew", in Greek, suggested "*man*", and "Philip", in Hebrew, might suggest, or be confused with, "*escape*, or, *deliverance*" (פלט) (a notion connected with his name by many very old traditions that must be discussed in another treatise) as appears from the actual substitution of פליטה for פיליפי, "Philip" in j. Taan. 68 *b* (Krauss. 448 *b*). The combination of the two would suggest "*the deliverance of the Greeks or Gentiles.*"

[**1015** *f*] We find St Paul telling us that (Gal. iv. 25) "this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia," and the Epistle to the Hebrews asserting that (vii. 9) "So to say, through Abraham, even *Levi*, who receiveth tithes, *hath paid tithes.*" With similar etymological personification or poetic representation, evangelists, about A.D. 70–80, rejoicing over the inclusion of the Greeks in the Church, might say that it had a prototype in the "deliverance" of the lost and saved one, *Philip*, who was a Greek in

approach Jesus to introduce "the Greeks", the representatives of the Gentiles, or, as Isaiah calls them, "the nations", who "shall come to the light" in Zion[1].

[**1016**] Our Evangelist has gradually been preparing us for this "coming". First, our Lord has spoken of His "*other sheep* that are *not of this fold*[2]," whom He must bring into the fold. Then Caiaphas, that high-priest of Satan—inspired like Balaam, against his will, by a Higher Power—"prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but that he might gather together into one *the children of God that are scattered abroad*[3]," that is, such Jews and Gentiles alike as were elect. Lastly the whole Sanhedrin, dejected by Christ's triumphant entry into Jerusalem, unconsciously predict His triumph—speaking of it as past (for thus Hebrew prophecy often blends its tenses) and saying, *in what they mean to be vernacular hyperbole but the Evangelist means otherwise,* "Behold how ye prevail nothing: lo, *the world is gone after him*[4]." By "the world", *the Pharisees* meant "the multitude", the "common people"—the "people of the earth" as they called them, the "accursed", who "knew not the law." But *John* means the human world, created by God in His own image. Immediately after this unwilling prophecy, occurs the coming of the Greeks, the first-fruits of the nations of "*the world*".

§ 6. *The truth as described by John:* (iii) *the place*

[**1017**] So much for the time, or occasion, assigned by John to the Bath Kol. Now—Gethsemane being once more,

name, and in the calling of *Andrew*, "the *man* (of Greece)": "[*So to say, even before the Resurrection*] *the Greeks*, who came to the Lord afterwards through Peter, *came to Him already before the beginning of the Gospel through Philip and Andrew.*" Drop "So to say...Resurrection," and we have the Johannine legend.

[1] Is. lx. 3. [2] Jn x. 16.

[3] Jn xi. 51–2: comp. Hort on 1 Pet. i. 1 "'You Christians of the Asiatic provinces are the true *strangers of dispersion*,' St Peter seems to say." [4] Jn xii. 19.

for the reasons above mentioned, necessarily set aside—what place would he naturally deem appropriate? The choice of place would, in some measure, depend upon the choice of time. If the latter was the moment when the Jews finally rejected Christ, then the former could be nothing else but the Temple. According to the Synoptists, it was from the Temple that Christ—after some three days of preaching following an attempt to purify its uncleanness—went forth in the evening for the last time to sit upon Mount Olivet in the growing darkness, dooming the building of Herod to destruction, and predicting the judgment of the world and the coming of the Son of man uplifted on the clouds. John indeed differs from the Synoptists at this stage in some important points. He places the attempt at purification long before. According to him, not three days, but three years of respite, had been given to the nation in vain; and no attempt is recorded by him as being made to purify now. But still he agrees with his predecessors in synchronizing Christ's rejection by the Jews (the blind people who say, "Who is this Son of man?") with His final exit from the building "made with hands".

[1018] From another point of view, the Temple might seem to John naturally connected with the coming of the Greeks. He has just described Christ's entry into Jerusalem in the words of Zechariah, "Behold, thy king cometh": and how could the Son of God and King of Israel, solemnly entering His city, fail to go at once—as the Synoptists say He did—to His Father's palace, still the House of God though desecrated by men? This being the case, the Evangelist might naturally pass on in thought to the prophet's context, which would seem to him to express—as Hebrew prophecy often does to the minds of Christian interpreters—the victories of the Kingdom of Peace in the language of the sword: "He shall speak peace unto the nations.....and I will stir up *thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece,* and

will make thee as the sword of a mighty man." "Were not the Apostles"—so an Evangelist might ask—"the *sons of Zion* who had been *stirred up* to conquer the *sons of Greece* with the word of the Lord Jesus, which was verily *the sword of a mighty man*?" The prophet goes on to say of Israel, "The Lord their God shall save them in that day as the *flock of his people*: for they shall be as the stones of a crown *lifted on high* over his land." Did not this predict that "*other flock*" —the flock of the Gentiles—of which the Lord made mention? Did it not mean that the Lord, "*lifted up*" *on the Cross and wearing the* "*crown*" *of thorns,* would "draw all men" up to share His throne and make them "*the stones of his crown*[1]"?

[1019] In an entirely different metaphor, we find the same prophet saying of the Messiah that He would grow up spontaneously as a branch, and that He would "*build the Temple*". Now in the mind of any Jew (provided that he has the least tincture of his national literature) a family is a "*building*"; and a "*son*" is at once a "*builder*" and a part of the "*building*"[2]. But a *building of God* is a *temple.* Hence "the Son of God" is "the *Temple*". And hence our Evangelist declares that when Jesus said "*Temple*", "he spake of the *temple of his body*[3]." The words of Zechariah are, "Behold the man whose name is THE BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall *build the temple of the Lord*[4]." John's conception is that Jesus of Nazareth, "growing up out of His place," did, by a spiritual act, not only *build* the Temple, but *become* the Temple, being the Eternal *Son.* When applying the metaphor of "seed" to the Kingdom of God, the Synoptic Parable of the Sower conveys the impression that "the seed" is a *thought,* sown by God or by

[1] Zech. ix. 9–13, ix. 16.

[2] The two words are etymologically connected, and play on the connection is frequent in Hebrew of all dates. See Gen. xvi. 2, xxx. 3 "*obtain children* (marg. *be builded*)," and Gesen. 125[a] and 120[a].

[3] Jn ii. 21.

[4] Zech. vi. 12.

the Spirit: John speaks of it as a *personality*, the Son of God. This is "the grain of wheat" that is to die and rise again and to grow up as the Temple in the New Jerusalem.

[1020] Lastly, the locality of the Temple was suitable both to the prayer, "*Glorify* thy name", and to the answer, "I have both *glorified* and again will *glorify*." For "in his temple", says the Psalmist, "everything says '*Glory!*'"[1]. It was in the Temple, also, that Isaiah (who according to John (xii. 41) "saw his *glory*") heard the Seraphim saying "the whole earth"—not Israel alone—"is full of his *glory*"[2]; and, according to the same prophet, God says (lx. 7) "The House of my *glory* I will *glorify*." Haggai, too, connects the building of the Temple with the glory of God—and a Christian such as Justin (and perhaps even John) might find a reference to the Cross in the context—"Go up to the mountain and bring *wood*[3], and *build the House*, and I will take pleasure in it, and *I will be glorified*, saith the Lord[4]."

---

[1] Ps. xxix. 9. [2] Is. vi. 3.

[3] [1020 *a*] Hagg. i. 8. The Christian Fathers, from Justin onwards, constantly see the Cross in the prophetic "*wood*", or "*tree*".

[4] [1020 *b*] In "the glory of the Lord" John would certainly include the self-sacrifice, as being the triumph, of the Son. When he says of Isaiah that "*he saw his glory*," though he probably refers—as the commentators say—to the vision of "the Lord high and lifted up upon a throne," he almost certainly takes "*lifted up*", as usual, to mean "lifted up on the throne of suffering," the Cross. Hence, under Isaiah's vision of "glory", he would see the afflictions of the Suffering Servant. Among these would come the sense of failure to redeem Israel. This feeling of *sorrow over Israel* is connected by Isaiah with *joy over the Gentiles*, in words that our Evangelist may have had in mind when he spoke of the "trouble" preceding the mention of glory (Is. xlix. 4–6 Heb. txt, R.V. marg.) "But I said, *I have laboured in vain*...yet surely my judgement is with the Lord, and my recompence with my God.....*but Israel is not gathered*, yet shall I be honourable in the eyes of the Lord.....yea, he saith, It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for *a light to the Gentiles*."

[1020 *c*] Describing the influx of the Gentiles into the Church, Isaiah says (lx. 7) "the house of (בית) *my glory* (תפארתי) *I will glorify*

§7. *The truth as it is*

[**1021**] The truth about a Voice from Heaven in response to Christ's Prayer is—so far as can be judged from the evidence above alleged—that although Christ prayed on the night before the Crucifixion, the exact words of the prayer have not been preserved[1], nor was there (at least in the popular

(אפאר)." It may be worth noticing that, if the bracketed ת were dropped after ת, the last two Hebrew words would mean, "*I have glorified, I will glorify.*"

[1] [**1021** *a*] In this connection, it is well to recall the fact that the Church has been permitted for many centuries to believe that Jesus taught His disciples to say in prayer "For thine is the Kingdom the power and *the glory* for ever and ever"—words now rejected (not of course as a useful doxological appendix but as an utterance of Christ's) by all competent critics.

[**1021** *b*] This fact—besides having a bearing on *à priori* arguments (unimportant in my opinion) as to what amount of temporary ignorance God might permit in the Church—may bear upon John's version of our Lord's Prayer, because in the *Didaché* a Eucharistic doxology occurs in a short form mentioning "*glory*" alone (ix. 2–3, x. 2–4) "To thee the *glory* for ever." The *Acts of John* represents Jesus, just before His arrest, as teaching His disciples to say simply "*Glory* to thee, Father, Glory to thee, Logos &c." The Codex Bobbiensis (in its version of Mt. vi. 14) has merely "thine is the *might* (virtus)," and the Thebaic Version (Chase p. 174) and many other authorities omit "kingdom". Now the word כבוד means not only "*glory*", but also (and primarily) "weight"; and the root appears (Trommius) in the LXX as "strengthen" or "prevail", κατισχύω (1), "great", μέγας (4), "make (*or*, be) strong," ἐνισχύω (4), "strong", ἰσχυρός (2), "violence", βία (1), besides having the frequent meanings of "heavy", "weight", "wealth" &c. Probably this Hebrew word was in the mind of the writer of 1 Pet. v. 11 "To him the *might* (κράτος) for ever." This word, if in the Hebrew Original, would naturally be expressed by two or more Greek words (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16 "to whom *honour and might* for ever"). The *Didaché*, too, besides the short form given above, has (ix. 4) "the *glory* and the power," (x. 5) "the power and the *glory*," where the variation of order suggests conflation from an original "glory", כבוד. There is, therefore, reason for supposing that the interpolated doxology in Mt. vi. 14 was once a short form, "*Glory* to thee" or "*Glory* to thy name," and that it has been enlarged, somewhat as the Diatessaron has enlarged Mk x. 37 "in thy *glory*", by

sense of the phrase) either then or at any time, a Voice from Heaven. But the truth does not end here. Though we do not know the words, we do know the spirit of the prayer, and we do know both that it was answered from heaven and also what was the nature of the answer.

[**1022**] The spirit of the Prayer needs to be expressed for different persons, nations, churches, and generations, in different phrases, varying with the varieties of human nature. We may take it as certain that, as coming from our Lord, and as it would have been then understood by any pious Jew, it meant something equivalent to "Hallow, or glorify, thy name." For us, "Glorify thy name" is an antiquated phrase that needs explanation now. So, too, similar phrases needed to be explained of old. For example, the words in the Hymn of Moses, (lit.) "He is my God and I will *beautify* him[1]," were very variously explained by the Jews. "Can man", said Rabbi Ismael, "make his Creator beautiful? [No], but the

---

combining it with the parallel Mt. xx. 21 "in thy *kingdom*", so as to produce "in thy *glory and thy kingdom*."

[**1021** *c*] The doxology is ambiguous. In the *Acts of John* it probably means "Glory *be* to thee"; in the *Didaché*, "Glory *belongs* to thee." It is quite possible that John, being aware of the various interpretations not only of the first clause of the Lord's Prayer but also of this traditional appendix, may have wished to reconcile those who contended, on the one hand that God's kingdom and glory were eternal and not dependent on man's prayers, and on the other that God was not yet King and not yet glorified because men rebelled against Him. John's solution is that although the glory of God's name was unchangeable and eternal, yet the Name had still to be glorified. But men could not glorify it. None but the Father could glorify it. The divine glory was not dependent on men any more than the objective brightness of the sun depends upon the clouds of one small planet. The glory of the Name would remain evermore unchanged, but the Name could not be duly glorified till it dispersed the mists in the minds of men.

[1] [**1022** *a*] Exod. xv. 2 "And I will *beautify* him (ואנוהו)." R.V. "I will *praise* him," A.V. "I will *prepare* him *a habitation*," Onk. "I will *build* him *a sanctuary*," Jer. (in long paraphrase) "we will *praise* him," Gesen. (627 *a*) ("si vera lectio") "I will *beautify*, *adorn* him (with praises)," LXX δοξάσω.

meaning is, I will make for Him that which is beautiful by observing His precepts. I will make Him a beautiful Lulab [*i.e.* Hosanna-bunch of palms &c.], a beautiful Tabernacle [at the feast of Tabernacles], a beautiful Trumpet [for the feast of Trumpets] &c." Another Rabbi said that the NAME is glorified when Israel does God's will, because their enemies hear how (Josh. v. 1) the Lord dried up the waters of Jordan or (Josh. ii. 10) the Red Sea—*i.e.* because of the military glories of the Chosen People. But Abba Saul, by splitting into two and slightly modifying "I will beautify", so as to make "I and (? even) HE," arrived at—or perhaps we should say illustrated—his conclusion that one must imitate God: "As He is pitiful and tender-hearted, so be thou[1]." This Rabbi is indefensible as a grammarian. But spiritually we may sit at his feet. For he taught in the same spirit as our Lord, (Lk. vi. 36) "Be ye merciful even as your Father is merciful," and again, (Mt. v. 16) "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven[2]."

[**1023**] This is the axiom on which Christ's prayer is based, namely, that God is glorified when man conforms himself, or leads his brethren to conform themselves, in *fact*, to that image of the Father in which man was made in *idea*. This "conformation"—called by St Paul "edifying" or "building"—may

[1] [**1022** *b*] For these quotations, see Schöttg. (Mt. v. 16) quoting Mechilta 27. 1 foll., and J. Talm. Schwab ii. 6 (*Pea*, 1). Another Rabbi (Schwab *ib.*) taught that one must give the fifth of one's goods to the poor, another the whole. "Make for Him that which is beautiful" (Schöttg. "pulchrum s. gratum faciam ei")=(Schwab) "on peut embellir les objets par lesquels on accomplit ses préceptes." The same passage occurs in B. Sabbath 133 *b*.

[2] [**1022** *c*] Comp. Schöttg. *ib.* "Unless there were righteous and pious men in Israel (Schöttg., by error, "in mundo") who exalt me more than all the world by their good works." But in sayings like these the context needs to be examined to shew whether the "*good works*" are those of R. Ismael or Abba Saul. A "good *Lulab*" is *not* what Christ and Abba Saul meant by a "good *work*".

also be called "righteousness", which, when taken in its full sense, is the sole duty of man. It is the building up of a character, a structure that is at once a temple and an image of God—according to the saying of Plato, "God is as righteous as possible, and there is nothing more like God than the man that is as righteous as possible."

[**1024**] Upon the same axiom is based the truth conveyed in the answer from heaven, "I have both glorified and will again glorify." There is probably a reference to the two-fold glorifying of the Name by the generation and by the resurrection of the Son. But there is more than this. Though only the past and the future are indicated in *word*, the present is also indicated in the present *act*, so that the meaning is, "I have been, am, and shall be, glorifying my Name of Father in glorifying Man, my Son, made in my image: and this glorifying has been and will be fulfilled whenever I raise up this man or that man nearer to the throne of my glory by inspiring him with the spirit of sonship and brotherhood through toil, and trouble, and self-sacrifice[1]."

[**1025**] Taken together, the prayer and the answer inculcate the essential divinity of a good man. Such a one, when comparing him to God, we modern orthodox Christians are disposed to call "*a mere man*", or "*a common man*". So did the Greeks and Romans, except in the case of some—by no means always "good" (Hercules for example), whom they supposed to have been born of supernatural intercourse between the Gods of Olympus and the women of earth—known to us as "demigods". Very different is the Johannine conception. John follows the lines of Peter's vision forbidding the Apostle to give the name of "common" to what God had "cleansed". Accordingly, in its prologue, the Fourth Gospel

[1] [**1024** *a*] Comp. Exod. iii. 14 "I AM hath sent me unto you" with Jer. Targ. (I) "I AM HE WHO IS AND WHO WILL BE hath sent me unto you," where the Targumist expands the single tense into two tenses.

tells us that those who received Jesus were "*not begotten from the will of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God.*" These are what many Christians would call "*mere men*". But according to John's view, these "*mere men*" are God's sons and temples, whom He is continually "*begetting*", or building. Each of His sons is a temple of the Holy Spirit: and yet there are not many sons, but one Son, not many temples, but one Temple. For, as there is a Unity in the Trinity of the Godhead, so is there a unity in the multiplicity of the Church.

[**1026**] This, then, is the truth about the glory of God—which is the subject of Christ's prayer and of God's answer—namely, that its crowning manifestation is not in ritual, or beauty, or power, but in a good man. And, so far, many of the Greek philosophers would go with John. But they underrated the difficulty and depreciated the drudgery, so to speak, of the pursuit of goodness, because they did not understand the sacredness of labour for others, of pain for others, of trouble for others, the mystery of the Cross, the secret of the Father and Lord of all revealing Himself through His Son as the Servant of His creatures. It was the supreme glory of Israel (for the most part a stiff-necked and sensual nation), that a chosen few among them had been inspired—Isaiah, or one of the Isaiahs, most of all—with the vision of the ideal Sovereign, this suffering Servant of servants: and it was the glory of Him whom Philip called "Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph[1]" that He had fulfilled this ideal.

[**1027**] According to the present belief of millions of Christians, if Jesus was "the son of Joseph" He was "*a mere man*"; and Philip himself, apparently sharing this belief, says to Jesus "Shew us the Father[2]." If Philip still thought Him to be "the son of Joseph", that is to say "*a mere man*", he would seem logically justified, according to the view of the millions above mentioned, in distinguishing Him from

[1] Jn i. 45. [2] Jn xiv. 8.

God and in uttering this request. Yet Jesus replies, "Have I been so long time with you and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou, Shew us the Father?" What is Philip recorded by the Fourth Gospel to have learned from Jesus—during that "long time"—that should have made him feel that he saw the Father when he saw "the son of Joseph"? Had Jesus taught him that He was *not* "the son of Joseph"? There is no hint of it. No theologian—worth calling such—has taught, or could teach, that such a thing had happened. Some indeed, in answer to the question "What had Philip learned?" may reply, "The Apostle had been taught that Jesus was God's Son by the Voice from Heaven at the Transfiguration." But the Fourth Gospel makes no mention of this. Others may say, "He had witnessed Christ's miracles." Well, Elijah (according to the Old Testament) worked miracles, and as many as the Johannine Christ. Elisha worked twice as many. Yet would Elijah have been justified in saying to Elisha, or Elisha in saying to one of the sons of the prophets, "*He that hath seen me hath seen Jehovah*"? If either prophet had said such a thing, would not all Israel have justly stoned him as a blasphemer?

[**1028**] The truth appears to be (according to our Evangelist) that what Philip had learned, during that "long time", was that Jesus was "*a man as righteous as possible.*" So far as we can judge from the Fourth Gospel, Philip still believed Jesus to be "the son of Joseph"; but, in the eyes of the Lord, this was no obstacle to the belief in His divinity. Without correcting Philip's error, if error it was, Jesus in effect commands him—and not without a suggestion of reproach for not having anticipated the command—to accept "the son of a carpenter" as one whom, having seen, Philip had seen the Father in heaven. Some people would regard such a command as mad or blasphemous. But that is because they have as yet only heathen conceptions of God, or

conceptions far beneath those of the best and wisest of the heathen. Let them sit for awhile in the ante-room of the Greeks at Plato's feet in order to prepare them to pass into the sanctuary of the Holy One of God. Why should not Philip accept the carpenter's son as the very image of God, if he felt him to be "a man as righteous as possible," and if the Greek philosopher was right in saying that, in comparison with such a man, "*There is nothing more like God*"?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

NARRATIVES OF THE BAPTISM

(*Greek and Latin*)

i. The Synoptists (**1029–31**); ii. John (**1032–3**); iii. Arabic Diatessaron, see **556**; iv. Justin Martyr (**1034–6**); v. Celsus (**1037–9**); vi. Testament of the XII Patriarchs (**1040–1**); vii. Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes (**1042**); viii. Ephrem Syrus (**1043–4**); ix. Gospel of the Ebionites (**1045**); x. Sibylline Oracles (**1046–8**); xi. Epiphanius (**1049–50**). The accentuation somewhat varies in the various extracts.

(i) *The Synoptists*

Mk i. 9–11

[**1029**] Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάνου. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ [ἐγένετο] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

Mt. iii. 13, 16–17

Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάνην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.... βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν (marg. ins. αὐτῷ) οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα (marg. ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ εὐδ.).

Lk. iii. 21–2

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

Mk	Mt.	Lk.
[1030] D και εγενετο εν ταις ημ. εκειναις ηλθεν ο ιης απο ναζαρεθ της γαλιλαιας και εβαπτισθη ις την ιορδανην υπο ιωαννου και αναβαινων εκ το υδατος ειδεν ηνυγμενους τους ουρανους και το πνα ως περιστεραν καταβαινων..... (omits [ἐγένετο])...	D is lost as far as καταβαινοντα εκ του ουρανου ως περιστεραν και ερχομενον εις αυτον και ιδου φωνη εκ των ουρανων λεγουσα προς αυτον συ ει ο υιος.....	D.....και και (*sic*) προσευχομενου ανοιχθηναι.....ως περιστεραν εις αυτον και φωνην εκ του ουρανου γενεσθαι υιος μου ει συ εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε.
[1031] SS is lost.	SS "Then came J. from G. unto John that he might baptize him in the Jordan..... And when he was baptized and went up out of the water, lo, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending in the likeness of a dove, and it abode upon him: and a voice was heard from heaven, which said unto him, Thou art my Son and my beloved, in thee I am well pleased."	SS "And when all the people were baptized, Jesus also was baptized, and while he prayed, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the likeness of the body of a dove, and a voice was heard from heaven, Thou art my Son, and my beloved; in whom I am well pleased."

(ii) *John*

[1032] Jn i. 28—34 Ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάνης βαπτίζων.

Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον Ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν· κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων. Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάνης λέγων ὅτι Τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν· κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ· κἀγὼ ἑώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. [W.H. 1881, marg. ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς for ὁ υἱὸς. This is now confirmed by SS, see **1033** *ad fin.*]

D is lost.

[**1033**] SS "These things he spake in Beth 'Abara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

And the [ ] day Jesus coming unto him and said [ ] of God who taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, A man cometh after me, and he was before me: because he existed before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made known to Israel, I am come to baptize with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit [ ] descended from heaven, and abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is *the chosen of God.*"

(iii) *The Arabic Diatessaron*

See **556**.

(iv) *Justin Martyr*

[**1034**] (*Tryph.* § 88) Ὥστε οὐ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐνδεῆ δυνάμεως ἐπεπροφήτευτο ἐλεύσεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς δυνάμεις τὰς κατηριθμημένας ὑπὸ Ἡσαίου, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐπέκεινα μὴ

μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι.....καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη ἢ πλείονα ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα μείνας, μέχρις οὗ προελήλυθεν Ἰωάννης κῆρυξ αὐτοῦ τῆς παρουσίας, καὶ τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὁδὸν προϊών, ὡς καὶ προαπέδειξα. Καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμόν, ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη[1] ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.

[1035] Καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐνδεᾶ αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ἢ τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς πνεύματος οἴδαμεν αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι ὡς ἐνδεὴς τούτων ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων...καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ νομιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱοῦ ὑπάρχειν, καὶ ἀειδοῦς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκήρυσσον, φαινομένου, καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου (ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον), τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν τὸ ἅγιον καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὡς προέφην, ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς ἐπέπτη αὐτῷ, καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἅμα ἐληλύθει, ἥτις καὶ διὰ Δαβὶδ λεγομένη, ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅπερ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔμελλε λέγεσθαι, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, τότε γένεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώ-

[1] [1034 *a*] Ἀνήφθη might be corrected into *ἀνῆφθαι*, as suggested by Thirlby but not adopted by Otto. Ἀνῆφθαι, written, as in early MSS. is freq., *ανηφθε*, before the *ε* in *εν*, might easily drop *ε* and then be corrected into the familiar *ἀνήφθη* (comp. Ps. cv. 15 *ἅψησθε*, ℵ *απτεσθαι*).

[1034 *b*] But Justin may have intended to write "a fire was kindled... and the Spirit descended," then, as he proceeded, becoming impressed with the necessity of alleging apostolic authority, he perhaps altered the construction of the last part of the sentence without making the corresponding alteration in the first part.

[1034 *c*] Or, he may mean, "We all know that a fire was kindled because that was a matter of observation; but that the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove could not be known to mere uninspired men even if they saw the dove, and therefore we accept the latter statement on the authority of the inspired Apostles."

ποις, ἐξότου ἡ γνῶσις αὐτοῦ ἔμελλε γίνεσθαι· Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

[1036] (*ib.* § 103) *Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ διάβολος ἅμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ*[1] *λεχθείσης· Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ Προσκύνησόν μοι.*

(v) *Celsus* (quoted by Origen, ed. Lommatzsch)

[1037] (Cels. i. 40) *Ἐξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, τάχα δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελίων, λαβὼν τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐπιπτάσης τῷ σωτῆρι βαπτιζομένῳ παρὰ τοῦ Ἰωάννου*[2] *περιστερᾶς, διαβάλλειν βούλεται ὡς πλάσμα τὸ εἰρημένον.*

[1038] (*ib.*) *Νυνὶ δὲ, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν, ὁ πάντ' εἰδέναι ἐπαγγειλάμενος Κέλσος τὰ ἡμέτερα, κατηγορεῖ τοῦ παρὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι*[3] *φανέντος ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς. Εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο διαβάλλει τὸ προφητεύεσθαι τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιδημίαν. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατρέχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἑξῆς τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀναγεγραμμένον, τὸ περὶ τοῦ ἀστέρος διήγημα, καὶ τῶν ἐληλυθότων ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μάγων προσκυνῆσαι τῷ παιδίῳ.*

[1039] (*ib.* 41) *Ἔστι δ' ὁ Ἰουδαῖος αὐτῷ ἔτι ταῦτα λέγων, πρὸς ὃν ὁμολογοῦμεν εἶναι Κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν Ἰησοῦν· "λουομένῳ," φησὶ, "σοὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ*[4] *φάσμα ὄρνιθος ἐξ ἀέρος λέγεις ἐπιπτῆναι." Εἶτα πυνθανόμενος ὁ παρ' αὐτῷ Ἰουδαῖος*

[1] [1036 *a*] The sense seems to demand *αὐτῷ* "to him", which Clark's transl. gives without note. Otto has no note.

[2] [1037 *a*] "Desunt in Codd. Reg. et Basil. verba: *παρὰ τοῦ Ἰωάννου.* Vetus Vaticanus legit: *παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ.* Quid si vero scribendum sit: *παρὰ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ*; R."

[3] [1038 *a*] We should have expected *ἐν τῷ β. Παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ* occurring ((?) 1037*a*, 1039) in the context suggests that an original *βαπτισᾶτι* (*i.e.* "by the side of him that baptized Him," namely John) may have been corrupted into *βαπτίσματι.*

[4] [1039 *a*] "Cod. Jolian. habet in marg. *παρὰ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ.* Quae correctio non spernenda...."

φησι "τίς τοῦτο εἶδεν ἀξιόχρεως μάρτυς τὸ φάσμα; ἢ τίς ἤκουσεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φωνῆς εἰσποιούσης σε υἱὸν τῷ θεῷ, πλὴν ὅτι σὺ φῂς, καί τινα ἕνα ἐπάγῃ τῶν μετὰ σοῦ κεκολασμένων;"

(vi) *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. Sinker)

[1040] (Levi § 18) *Τότε ἐγερεῖ Κύριος ἱερέα καινὸν, ᾧ πάντες οἱ λόγοι Κυρίου ἀποκαλυφθήσονται..... Καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον αὐτοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὡς βασιλεὺς, φωτίζων φῶς γνώσεως..... Οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀγαλλιάσονται ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ γῆ χαρίσεται*[1]*, καὶ αἱ νεφέλαι εὐφρανθήσονται, καὶ ἡ γνῶσις Κυρίου χυθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡς ὕδωρ θαλασσῶν. Καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῆς δόξης*[2] *τοῦ προσώπου Κυρίου χαρίσονται*[1] *ἐν αὐτῷ.*

[1041] *Οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἥξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἁγίασμα μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς ὡς ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ πατρὸς Ἰσαάκ. Καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ' αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται, καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεως καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καταπαύσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι..... Καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐκλείψει πᾶσα ἁμαρτία, καὶ οἱ ἄνομοι καταπαύσουσιν εἰς κακά· οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι καταπαύσουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.*

(vii) *Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes* (quoted by Jerome)

[1042] Hieron. *comment. in Esaiae* xi. 2 (Kirchhofer p. 454) Illud, quod in Evangelio Matthaei omnes quaerunt Ecclesiastici et non inveniunt ubi scriptum sit: "*Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur*", eruditi Hebraeorum de hoc loco assumptum putant.... Super hunc igitur florem, qui de trunco et radice Jesse per Mariam virginem repente consurget, requiescet Spiritus Domini, quia in ipso complacuit omnem plenitudinem divinitatis habitare corporaliter, nequaquam per partes ut in reliquis sanctis, sed juxta Evangelium eorum, quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei, "*descendit super eum*

[1] Ed. note. *χαρή...* here and elsewhere.
[2] Ed. note. *δ. καί.*

omnis fons (נצר)[1] *Spiritus sancti.*"..... Porro in Evangelio cujus supra fecimus mentionem haec scripta reperimus: "*Factum est autem, quum adscendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus sancti et requievit super eum ac dixit ei: Fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis exspectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.*"

(viii) *Ephrem Syrus* (Comm. in Diatess., ed. Moesinger, pp. 42–3)

[**1043**] "Et Spiritus sanctus, qui super eum, quum baptizaretur, quievit, testatus est, eum esse pastorem; per Joannem enim propheticam et sacerdotalem dignitatem accepit. Regiam dignitatem domus David per nativitatem acceperat, quia ex domo David ortus erat, sacerdotium vero domus Levi per secundam nativitatem in baptismo filii Aaronis. Qui jam credit, secundam nativitatem ei fuisse in terra, ne dubitet, eum per posteriorem hanc nativitatem in baptismo Joannis accepisse sacerdotium Joannis. Quum illo die multi baptizarentur, Spiritus super unum descendit et quievit, ut, qui visu a ceteris non distinguebatur, hoc signo ab omnibus discerneretur.....

[**1044**] "Quare usque ad tricesimum annum eum non tentavit? Quia signum manifestum divinitatis ejus de coelo datum non erat et humilis ut quilibet alius homo apparebat.... Satanas tentationem ejus praetermisit, donec haec fieri inciperent. Et quum audisset 'Ecce venit agnus Dei' et 'is est qui tollit peccata mundi,' valde quidem obstupuit, sed exspectavit, donec baptizaretur, ut videret, utrum tamquam baptismo indigens baptizaretur. Quumque ex lumine super aquas exorto et ex voce de coelo delapsa cognovisset, eum ut

[1] So Kirchhofer, but the Hebrew נצר i.e. *Nazer*, or Branch, should have been printed after "eum". The meaning is "upon *Him* (i.e. the *Nazer*)."

indigentiarum expletorem in aquam descendisse, non vero ut indigentem ad baptismum venisse, secum perpendens dixit: Nisi in certamine et per tentationem eum probavero, cognoscere non potero, qui ille sit."

(ix) *The Gospel of the Ebionites* (quoted by Epiphanius)

[**1045**] (Epiphan. *adv. Haer.* xxx. 1. ii. 13, vol. I. p. 138) Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ, ἐπιφέρει, ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα, σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα, καὶ πάλιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. ὃν[1] ἰδὼν, φησιν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ, σὺ τίς εἶ Κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα. καὶ τότε, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε, δέομαί σου Κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον. ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ[2], λέγων, ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα.

(x) *Sibylline Oracles* (ed. Friedlieb)

[**1046**] (i) (Bk vi. ll. 1—7)

Ἀθανάτου μέγαν υἱὸν ἀοίδιμον ἐκ φρενὸς αὐδῶ,
Ὧ θρόνον ὕψιστος γενέτης παρέδωκε λαβέσθαι,
Οὔπω γεννηθέντι· ἐπεὶ κατὰ σάρκα δοθεῖσαν

[1] [**1045** *a*] ὅν is probably an error for ὅ, which has been taken by a scribe as ὃ (a freq. error).

[2] [**1045** *b*] ? leg. αὐτῶ, *i.e.* αὐτόν.

Ἠγέρθη, προχοαῖς ἀπολουσάμενος ποταμοῖο
Ἰορδάνου, ὃς φέρεται γλαυκῷ ποδὶ κύματα σύρων·
Ὃς, πυρὸς ἐκφεύξας, πρῶτος Θεὸν ὄψεται ἠδύν,
Πνεύματι γινόμενον λευκαῖς πτερύγεσσι πελείης.

[1047] (ii) (*Ib.* vii. ll. 66—70)

Τλήμων, οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν σὸν Θεὸν, [ὅς] ποτ' ἔλουσεν
Ἰορδάνου ἐν ὑδάτεσσι, καὶ ἔπτατο πνεῦμα ἐπ' αὐτῷ
Ὃς πρὶν καὶ γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
Αὐθέντης γένητο λόγῳ Πατρὸς, πνεύματι δ' ἁγνῷ
Σάρκ' ἐνδυσάμενος[1], ταχὺς ἵπτατο πατρὸς ἐς οἴκους.

[1048] (iii) (*Ib.* ll. 79—84)

.....λαβὼν ἀγριηνὰ πετεινὰ,
Εὐξάμενος πέμψεις, εἰς οὐρανὸν ὄμματα τείνας·
Ὕδωρ δὲ σπείσεις καθαρῷ πυρὶ, τοῖα βοήσας·
Ὃς σε Λόγον γέννησε Πατὴρ, πάτερ, ὄρνιν ἀφῆκα[2],
Ὀξὺν ἀπαγγελτῆρα λόγων Λόγον, ὕδασιν ἁγνοῖς
Ῥαίνων σὸν βάπτισμα, δι' οὗ πυρὸς ἐξεφαάνθης.

(xi) *Epiphanius*

[1049] (i) (*Anaceph.* § 7, vol. II. p. 153 C—D) ...*ἐν ἀριθμῷ ἐτῶν λογισθεὶς, ἐν ἀριθμῷ μηνῶν, ἐν κοιλίᾳ κυοφορηθεὶς, γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωρδάνην, βαπτισθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, οὐκ ἐπιδεόμενος λουτροῦ· διὰ δὲ τὸ ἀκόλουθον τῆς ἐν νόμῳ ἐνανθρωπήσεως μὴ ταράσσων τὸ δίκαιον, ὅπως πληρωθῇ, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ἀληθινὴν σάρκα ἐνεδύσατο, ἀληθινὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν· κατερχόμενος εἰς τὰ ὕδατα, διδοὺς ἅπερ λαμβάνων, παρεχόμενος ἅπερ ἐπιδεόμενος, φωτίζων αὐτὰ, ἐνδυναμῶν αὐτὰ εἰς τύπον τῶν μελλόντων ἐν αὐτῷ τελειοῦσθαι· ὅπως οἱ αὐτῷ πεπιστευκότες*

[1] [1047 *a*] Perhaps we should read *εκδυσαμενος*. The two words are easily confused (as in Mt. xxvii. 28 and 31).

[2] [1048 *a*] Otto (Just. Mart. *Tryph.* § 88) adopts, besides *ἀφῆκε* for *ἀφῆκα*, the emendation of *πνεῦμα* for *πάτερ*. The two words, when abbreviated, $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ and $\overline{\pi\epsilon\rho}$ (rarely $\overline{\pi\rho}$), could easily be confused.

ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἔχοντες τὴν πίστιν τῆς ἀληθείας, μάθωσιν ὅτι ἀληθινῶς ἐνηνθρώπησεν, ἀληθινῶς ἐβαπτίσθη· καὶ οὕτως διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ συγκαταθέσεως καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐρχόμενοι, λάβωσι τῆς αὐτοῦ καταβάσεως τὴν δύναμιν, καὶ φωτισθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ φωταγωγίας, πληροφορούμενοι τῷ ἐν τῷ Προφήτῃ *ῥητῷ, εἰς μεταλλαγὴν δυνάμεως, εἰς παροχὴν σωτηρίας τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀπὸ τῆς* Ἱερουσαλὴμ *λαμβανομένης, καὶ τῆς ἰσχύος τοῦ ὕδατος.*

[**1050**] (2) (*Haer.* xxviii. 1, vol. I. p. 110 D) (*ὡς καὶ οὗτος ἐκήρυσσεν*).....*κατελθυθέναι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς αὐτόν, τουτέστι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς.*

(3) (*Haer.* xxx. 16, vol. I. p. 140 B) *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνωθεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκοντος Χριστοῦ ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς.*

(4) (*Ancor.* 119, vol. II. p. 121 B) *τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατέβαινεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ ὕδατα κατελθυθότα.*

(5) (*Anac.* 7, vol. II. p. 154 B) *ἀνελθὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ* Ἰορδάνου, *ἀκούων φωνὴν* Πατρὸς *εἰς ἀκοὴν παρόντων τῶν μαθητῶν, εἰς τὸ ὑποδεῖξαι τίς ὁ μαρτυρούμενος, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατερχομένου*.....*ἐπικαθεζομένου δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἐρχομένου ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, ἵνα ὀφθῇ ὁ μαρτυρούμενος*..... *ἵνα ὁ Υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ὀφθῇ, καὶ πληρώσῃ τὸ εἰρημένον· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων συναναστράφη.*

APPENDIX II

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE TRADITION "SUFFER IT TO BE SO NOW[1]"

§ 1. "*Sabach*" (*in Mk* xv. 34 "*Sabachthanei*") *may mean* "*suffer*"

[**1051**] An examination of the shorter sayings assigned to Christ would shew that about some (*e.g.* "Arise, let us go," "It is enough") the Evangelists appear to agree (or nearly so) as to the utterance, but to disagree as to its time, place, and circumstances. It is antecedently probable, as an early Christian writer has implied[2], that, in the confusion and

---

[1] Mt. iii. 15.

[2] [**1051** *a*] Macarius, defending or explaining the variation (Mk-Mt.) "reed" and (Jn) "hyssop", says of the Evangelists (p. 29—31) "They observe the Law of History and do not write a single word beyond what was said at the time (*τότε*) in the seething confusion of the [prevailing] frenzy (*ἐν τῷ ζέοντι τῆς μανίας θορύβῳ*). For the inciters were Jews, and the judges Romans, barbarous races both, with no claim to a liberal education, and without any of the refinement of Hellenic training.... Consequently their intoxicated behaviour and the [whole] uncouth business [uncouth] in word and deed occurrent at the time in unseemly fashion was written down by the writers without the addition of any smoothing falsehood (*τὴν ἀλλόκοτον πρᾶξιν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τότε γινομένην ἀπρεπῶς ἔγραψαν οἱ γράφοντες μηδὲν ἐπιψευσάμενοι*). For it is not lawful for a historian to write anything beyond what is done [at the time] or said [at the time] even though the language be barbarous....It is not surprising, then, if even the Evangelists appear to use some uncouth

disorder during the crucifixion, events would be discordantly reported almost from the first; and the same statement might apply even to the words of the Saviour. Then attempts would be made, from Greek as well as from Hebrew or Aramaic traditions, to explain what was obscure and to emend what seemed corrupt. These explanations and emendations would in the natural course of things be often erroneously added to the original text of the Gospels. Then variations would arise when Evangelists attempted to adjust these additions to what appeared their fit occasions, and to place them in their right order. Thus a multitude of varying traditions would be evolved, adopted by one genuine Gospel, or two at most, or interpolated spuriously in only one Gospel, or occurring in some non-canonical tradition. All these would be ramifications from one stem.

[1052] Such a stem is perhaps to be found in the only articulate saying of our Lord upon the Cross recorded by the two earliest Evangelists, as printed in capital letters below:

Mk xv. 33–7 (lit.)	Mt. xxvii. 45–50 (lit.)	Lk. xxiii. 44–6 (lit.)
"...over the whole of the land until the ninth hour. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, ELOI, ELOI, LAMA SABACHTHANEI, which is, being interpreted, O MY GOD,	"...over all the land until the ninth hour. But about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, ELOI, ELOI, LEMA SABACHTHANEI, that is, MY GOD, MY GOD, WHERE-	..." over the whole of the land until the ninth hour, *the sun failing* [or, *being eclipsed*] [or, *Elijah failing him* i.e. *forsaking* (*him*)]..... ...And, having cried with a loud cry, Jesus

expressions (*τινα συγγράφειν ἀλλόκοτα*) since they do not like to smooth words down but take pains to preserve the actual utterance."

[**1051** *b*] How could the nationality of Christ's crucifiers or revilers influence an Evangelist in choosing between the words "reed" and "hyssop", unless we are to suppose that the Evangelists—owing to the absence of the disciples from the neighbourhood of the Cross—were dependent on the testimony of subsequently converted spectators, either Jewish mockers or Roman soldiers? If that were the case, it would introduce potent elements of confusion.

Mk xv. 33–7 (lit.)

[MY GOD], TO WHAT [END] DIDST THOU FORSAKE ME? And some of them that stood-by, having heard, began to say, 'Lo, Elijah doth he call.'.....*Let ye* [*me do this*,] let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down. But Jesus, having (lit.) *let-go*[1] a loud cry, breathed forth [his spirit]."

Mt. xxvii. 45–50 (lit.)

FORE DIDST THOU FORSAKE ME? But some of them that stood there, having heard, began to say [that], 'Elijah doth this [man] call'..... ...*Let thou* [*it alone*], let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him. But Jesus, having again exclaimed with a loud cry, *let-go*[1] his spirit."

Lk. xxiii. 44–6 (lit.)

said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.* But, having said this, he breathed forth [his spirit]."

[**1053**] The words *Eloi, Eloi* &c. are from Ps. xxii. 1, the Aramaic *sabach*[2], "forsake", being substituted for the Biblical *azab* which has the same meaning. *Eloi*, however, is not Aramaic. The Hebrew has "*Eli*" (not "*Heli*"), *i.e.* "my strong one", meaning "my God"[3]. In the Gospel of Peter, no Hebrew or Aramaic is given but only this translation, "My *strength, strength*, thou hast quite left me[4]." *Eloi*, "my God", is free from this ambiguity, but is neither the exact Aramaic form nor the original Hebrew.

[**1054**] The Biblical verb "hast thou forsaken" is *azabthanei*. The scribe of D (in Mark and Matthew) has tried to give this; but, by changing *b* to *p*, and dropping the first *a*

[1] "Let-go". This and other literalisms in the translation are intended to indicate that one Greek word, "let (go)", "suffer", "forgive", permeates this narrative under different English renderings.

[2] Strictly *shabak*, or *sabak*; but R.V. and Gk. *sabach*.

[3] [**1053** a_1] But the Latin MSS., the best guides here, have initial *h*, indicating that the Hebrew was transliterated as "Heli" in early times. Oxf. Conc. says that "Elijah" is aspirated in Joseph., Luc., and Vind.

[4] [**1053** *a*] *Evang. Petr.* § 5 Ἡ δύναμίς μου, ἡ δύναμις, κατέλειψάς με. This drops "why?" the 2nd "my", and ἐν- before καταλείπω.

(perhaps confused with the final *a* in *lama*) he has produced *zapthanei*. Codex B (in Mark) has conflated *b* and *p* (and perhaps transposed the initial *a*) so as to give *zabaphthanei*. These facts are important in their bearing on what follows, and also as shewing what pains were taken in very early times to recover the exact words, and even syllables, of this utterance.

[1055] It must be added that D, in Mark, gives an astonishing rendering of *azab*, viz. "reproach" ("why didst thou *reproach* (ὠνείδισας) me?"). This perhaps arose from one of many attempts to correct the Aramaic *sabach* into some Biblical word. It happens that one Biblical word meaning "forsake" (הרפה) is, in its first three letters, almost identical with חרפ (חרף), the regular word for "insult" or "reproach[1]". But in any case, this astonishing translation—to which attention was called by a very early heathen controversialist[2] assailing the discrepancies of the Gospels—shews what serious difficulties some of the very earliest Evangelists experienced in attempting, at this point, to give Christ's exact words.

[1056] Now the Biblical *azab*, "*forsake*", is free from ambiguity; but the Aramaic *sabach* means not only "*forsake*", but also "*let*", "*let alone*", "*let off* (*from punishment*)"; and indeed, when it occurs in the Bible—as it does five times in Daniel and Ezra—it *never means* "*forsake*" *but always* "*spare*", "*leave alone*". Unfortunately, too, precisely the same ambiguity adheres to the Greek ἀφίημι, which is used by the LXX in three out of the four cases in which it translates *sabach* (which the LXX once omits). This Greek word means occasionally "*forsake*"; but it far more fre-

[1] [1055 *a*] Tromm. has הרפה (hif. of רפה)=ἀφίημι (3), ἐῶ (2), ἐγκαταλείπω (2): חרף=ὀνειδίζω (34). But I have found no instance where the two are confused.

[2] Macarius, p. 21.

quently means "*let*", "*let alone*", "*let off*", "*forgive*[1]": and this is the word that is used by Mark and Matthew above in the phrases "*let* ye", "*let* thou", (lit.) "*let-go* a cry", (lit.) "*let-go* his spirit"—all of which are omitted by Luke. But Luke—in a later edition of his Gospel, or in an interpolation—has this very word in an utterance of Jesus on the Cross (xxiii. 34) "Father, (lit.) *let them off* (i.e. *forgive them*) for they know not what they do." The earlier evangelists must have been grossly ignorant if Christ uttered this saying and if they did not know it. They must have been sadly wanting in spiritual judgment if they knew of it and did not insert it. Probably it was one of a group of erroneous traditions that all branched forth from the Biblical or Aramaic quotation from the Psalms[2]. We shall presently attempt to shew the process of ramification, but must first indicate other sources of error in the context.

§ 2. *"Heli" might be taken by Evangelists as "Elijah" or "the sun"; "sabach" as "forsake" or "be eclipsed"; "lama" as "why?" or "to some extent"*

[1057] It is extremely unlikely that Roman soldiers would allow a Jew to give drink from their wine to a prisoner undergoing crucifixion. Mark probably assumes that one of the soldiers gave it, and that the soldiers took *Eloi*, or *Heli*, to mean "*Helias*" or "*Elijah*". But this can hardly be historical. The two names sound very differently. And a Roman soldier would not be likely to know about Elijah (if anything) enough to lead him into this confusion.

[1] Ἀφίημι has all these meanings, both in O.T. and in N.T.

[2] [**1056** *a*] Luke alters "*My God*" into "*Father*". Hegesippus says that James the Righteous, when dying, said (Euseb. ii. 23. 15—16) "*Lord, God, Father*, forgive them, for they know not what they do," perhaps a conflation of "God", אֵלִי, as "*God*" and "*Father*" (κε="and", might be confused in Gk with $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$="Lord"). "The Righteous" might mean either Jesus (Acts vii. 52, xxii. 14) or James the Lord's brother, so that a saying about the one might easily be taken as referring to the other.

[**1058**] More probably Mark's legend arose from glosses, or Targums, explaining *Eloi* and *(H)eli.* For example, opposite to *Eloi,* some one might write "*This is* [in the original Psalm, not *Eloi* but] *(H)eli* (אלי הוא)." But these letters—if the final א is dropped—happen to mean "*Elijah*"[1]. Or, again, some—wishing to guard against Pseudo-Peter's rendering of *Heli* (namely, "my *strength*")—might insert "*Jehovah*" over the word, and a blending of the two might be taken to mean "*Elijah*". But the most probable explanation is that the reduplication of *Heli* was misunderstood—as Hebrew reduplications are frequently omitted or misrendered by the LXX[2]—and rendered as two distinct words, the first *Hel* (אל) being taken as the preposition "for" or "to", and the second as part of the name "Elijah". Thus "*Heli, Heli, he* (אלי אלי הוא) calleth," was taken as "*for Elijah* (אל אליהו)[3] he-calleth."

[**1059**] As regards the dialogue between the soldiers, it is explicable by the fact (mentioned above (**874** *a*) in similar instances) that the same Hebrew phrase may mean either (1) "Some *say*", "one *says*", or (2) "some *said* [*at the time*]," "some one *said* [*at the time*]." Hence a Hebrew Targum ("some say")[4], *intended merely to state contemporaneous differences of opinion among very early Christian Evangelists* as to the meanings of *Heli* (and also of *sabach* and *azab*), might be

[1] [**1058** *a*] Gesen. 45 *a* אליהו = "Elijah" more than 60 times: Levy (i. 456 *b*) gives instances of הו as N. Heb. for הוא; but Dalman (*Aram. Gr.* p. 76) says that this spelling is only with ו and ד.

[2] [**1058** *b*] Comp. Is. xlviii. 11 "for mine own sake," Heb. twice, LXX once, Ezek. xvi. 6 "in thy blood live," Heb. twice, LXX once. In 2 S. vi. 3—4 "out of the house of A.," Heb. twice, B has "*into* the house" once, and omits the repetition (which A however inserts correctly). In Judg. v. 23 "to the help of the Lord," Heb. twice, B has "to the help of the Lord, to the help," A "to the help of the Lord, *the Lord is our help.*" Such instances are numerous.

[3] [**1058** *c*] Both Delitzsch and Resch give the Hebrew thus.

[4] [**1059** *a*] Comp. the marginal note on Is. ix. 1 (Q marg.) "some (τινες) do not have 'the way of the sea.'"

converted into *a Greek dialogue between Roman soldiers using these words, and saying, at the time, "Elijah", "permit", "let"* &c.

[**1060**] The same Greek word may mean "Elijah" or "sun"[1]. Hence, in Greek, "He called out [as though] *Elijah* were forsaking him," might be taken to refer to the "*sun*" instead of "*Elijah*". We have also seen (**1053** *a*) that the compound verb εγκαταλειπω is shortened, in the Gospel of Peter, by dropping the *first* of its two prepositions. By retaining the first and dropping the *second* preposition, an Evangelist would obtain the verb εγλειπω read as εκλειπω "be *eclipsed*"[2], which might seem to Luke exactly adapted to his rendering of *Heli* as "the *sun*" ("the sun *being eclipsed*"). The difficulty of a solar eclipse during a full moon might not arise till the Gospel had been too widely circulated to suppress the phrase. As it is, a great number of authorities or MSS. have altered it into "the sun was *darkened*," but W. H. maintain in their text "the sun *failing*, or, *being eclipsed*," and do not give "darkened" even as an alternative. "*Sun*" may have been a mistake for *Heli*, and "*eclipsed*" for "*forsake*"[3].

[1] [**1060** *a*] In the LXX "Elijah"=mostly ηλ(ε)ιογ, in N.T. ηλειας. The former, when spelt ηλιογ, would be identical with "sun". In Orig. *Comm. Joann.* (Huet, pp. 17, 69) the Latin renders ηλιος first *Elias* and then *sol.* On the breathing of η in ηλιας, see **1053** a_1.

[2] For εγλειπω=εκλειπω, see Tebtunis *Pap.* CV. 44, CVI. 23.

[3] [**1060** *b*] See W.H. *ad loc.* Ἐκλείπω might mean "fail", "fall short", as applied to candle-light, but could hardly mean anything but "be eclipsed" when applied to "sun" and "moon", except in poetic prose of an oriental tinge.

[**1060** *c*] According to this view, "sun" arose from the double process of transliterating "Elijah" as ηλιογ and then translating it as a Greek word. We may compare Josh. xi. 3 "*Hermon*", LXX "*wilderness*" (ἔρημον), but AF Αερμων: 1 S. xv. 23 (R.V.) "*teraphim*" (A.V.) "*idolatry*", LXX (Swete) "*service*", θεραπείαν, but A θεραφειν (see Field): Job vi. 19 "the companies of *Sheba*," LXX Σαβών, but $A^{vid.}$ "impious", ασεβων. In 1 S. xv. 3, the word "*Cherem*", meaning "devote to destruction", is conflated (1) as the name of a place, (2) as "destroy", (3) as "devote to destruction by a curse," Ἱερεὶμ...ἐξολεθρεύσεις...ἀναθεματιεῖς....

[**1061**] The word *lama*, or *lema*, i.e. "why?", might be dropped in many Greek traditions, being regarded as a Hebrew interrogative best dispensed with in Greek. At all events it is dropped (**1053***a*) in the Gospel of Peter. Mark renders it εἰς τί; "to what end?" In ordinary circumstances, this should cause no difficulty; for although in theory, εις τι, without accents, might mean "to *some* end", there are probably few instances in Greek literature, or at all events in Biblical Greek, where it has that meaning. But in a case like the present, where every word seems to have been strained in various ways to obtain some sense that might accord with prepossessions, and yet might remain (apparently) faithful to the text, we ought to be prepared for some distortion so as to make it mean "*to some extent* [*of place, or time*]," "*for the present*", "*as far as this*" &c.

[**1062**] If such a phrase, so distorted, was combined with *sabach*, "*suffer*", the result might be a tradition that Jesus said to some persons or person "*suffer thus far*". Hence might arise that obscure and variously rendered tradition, peculiar to Luke, that Jesus said on the night before the crucifixion (xxii. 51) "*Suffer ye as far as this.*" Others, taking the phrase to mean "*for the present*", and supposing (like the Roman soldiers according to the Synoptists) that Jesus uttered the words to *Elijah*, may have inferred that He uttered them to Elijah's representative, the *Baptist*—concerning whom Jesus was reported to have said (Mt. xi. 14) "This is *Elijah*". Then the question would arise, When could Jesus say to the Baptist, "*Suffer it for the present*"? And the answer would be that it must have been on the only occasion when the Synoptic Gospels described Jesus and the Baptist as being together, *i.e.* at the Baptism. This might explain the tradition peculiar to Matthew (iii. 15) "*Suffer it now*".

§ 3. *Ramifications from "sabach"*

[**1063**] On the hypothesis of ramification, it must be a matter of great difficulty, and perhaps may prove ultimately impossible, to shew in its order each stage of development: but we can at all events enumerate (1) Greek traditions that may have originated from a bare statement that Jesus used the *word* "*let go*", "*suffer*", or "*forgive*", in some critical moment on the night before the crucifixion; (2) others indicating that He performed the *act* of "letting go"; (3) others, in the same context, indicating that *bystanders* used the word "*let go*", or "*let be*", in connection with Christ's utterance. If these are peculiar to one Evangelist, or at most to two, that fact will increase the probability that the words were originally glosses.

[**1064**] It must be premised that the Greek word that will be found reiterated in these traditions, "let go", *ἀφίημι*, is peculiarly liable to misunderstanding owing to its irregular forms[1]. For example, the regular meaning of ΑΦΕΙϹ is participial, "*letting* go": but the barbarous Greek of the Apocalypse shews that early Christians might use it as the second person sing pres., "*thou art* letting go (or, forsaking)." The regular Greek for "thou art (or, art thou) forsaking me" would be ΑΦΙΗϹ ΜΕ: but in the written or oral tradition of moderately learned evangelists this might easily be confused with ΑΦΙΗΜΙ,

[1] [**1064** *a*] The LXX mostly shews little more than a free interchange of forms from *ἀφίω* with forms from *ἀφίημι*, *e.g.* *ἀφίοντες* and *ἀφίεντες*. But the introduction of a third present tense, the barbarous *ἀφῶ*, opens out new possibilities of confusion; and we find this in Exod. xxxii. 32, *ἀφεῖς*, "thou *forgivest* (or, *wilt forgive*)," and the same form ("thou *sufferest*") in Rev. ii. 20, and *ἀφῶ* in a Nubian inscription of the sixth century (not 3rd or 4th century, as Winer § 14. 3, p. 97) (Böckh 5072) containing such words as *επωκαν* (for *επιον*) *εγεγονεμην* (for *εγενομην*) and *εφιλονεικησουσι* and *αναχωρηθην*. These facts indicate unusual possibilities of corruption in such a word when employed in Greek oral and written tradition by illiterate Christians.

"I am giving up." Suppose, then, some early Greek Gospel, giving Christ's quotation from the Psalm in a condensed form intelligible to Gentiles, to have said, "Jesus, having cried *Dost thou forsake me?* in a loud voice, breathed his last," καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνήσας ΑΦΕΙCΜΕΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΦΩΝΗ ἐξέπνευσεν. It is easy to see that, ΜΕΜΕ being corrected (as an erroneous reduplication) into ΜΕ, and the barbarous ΑΦΕΙC being naturally taken by educated readers for the participle "*letting go*", there would result "*letting go with a loud voice,*" which, with a slight variation, is the actual reading of Codex Bobb. in Mark, lit. "*let-go* (emisit) *with* a loud voice (voce magna)[1]."

[**1065**] Then some might correct this by altering ΦΩΝΗ into the accusative ΦΩΝΗ̄ (*i.e.* φωνήν), as in Mark's present text[2], "letting go, *i.e.* uttering, a loud voice." Others might take the meaning to be φωνήσας μεγάλῃ φωνῇ, ἀφεὶς [πνεῦμα], ἐξέπνευσεν, "having cried with a loud voice, letting go (or, sending forth) his spirit, he breathed his last": then, dropping ἐξέπνευσεν as superfluous, they might rearrange the sentence as "having cried with a loud voice, he let go his spirit." This is Matthew's text. Again, another evangelist, finding ΑΦΙΗC written (over ΑΦΕΙC ΜΕ) as the correct form, might suppose that the barbarous Greek was intended to mean ἀφίημί με "I give myself up" (though it could not *lawfully* have that meaning); and, knowing by tradition that the words were supposed to come from the Psalms, might paraphrase the barbarism into the beautiful quotation uttered by pious Jews on their deathbed, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." This might represent Luke's view.

[**1066**] This being premised, the variations of this tradition will now be enumerated under the three heads mentioned above:

[1] SS has "when he had *cried with* a loud voice," which, however, may be merely a conformation to Matthew.

[2] Codex L, inconsistently, has φωνη μεγαλην.

(I) *The word Sabach, ἐγκαταλείπω, ἀφίημι, or ἐῶ, uttered by Jesus, meaning "forsake", "suffer", "forgive".*

(*a*) Used by Jesus during, or just before, the night of the crucifixion.

(1) Mk xv. 34 (Mt. xxvii. 46) *σαβαχθανεί.....εἰς τί* (Mt. *ἵνα τί με*) *ἐγκατέλιπές με;* (Lk. xxiii. 45 *ἐκλείποντος*), Mk.-Mt. "*forsake*"; Lk. "*be eclipsed*", but in his narrative, not as an utterance of Jesus.

(2) Lk. xxii. 51 *ἐᾶτε*[1] *ἕως τούτου* (?) "*suffer ye* up to this point," or "thus far", supposed by some to be addressed to the soldiers, by others to the disciples.

(3) Jn xviii. 8 *ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν*, "*suffer ye* these to depart," certainly addressed to the soldiers.

(4) [Lk. xxiii. 34] *Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς*, "Father, *forgive* them", either an interpolation, or addition made by Luke in a later edition of his Gospel.

(*b*) Used by Jesus, but during the Baptism.

Mt. iii. 15 *ἄφες ἄρτι*, "*Suffer* it for the present," addressed to John the Baptist, called by some "Elijah".

(II) *The act of "letting go" performed by Jesus.*

Mk xv. 37 *ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν.*

Mt. xxvii. 50 (*κράξας*) *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.*

In Mark, this is applied to the "voice", to Matthew to the "spirit".

(III) *The use of the word "let be", not by Jesus Himself, but in close connection with His last words about "forsaking".*

Mk xv. 36 *ἄφετε ἴδωμεν*, "*Let ye be*, let us see whether...".

Mt. xxvii. 49 *ἄφες ἴδωμεν*, "*Let thou be*, let us see whether...".

---

[1] [1066 *a*] For *ἐᾶ* parall. to *ἀφίημι*, see Dan. iv. 26 (23) LXX *ἀφίημι*, Theod. *ἐᾶ*: Ezr. vi. 7 *ἀφίημι*=1 Esdr. vi. 26 *ἐᾶ*. In both these cases the original is *sabach*.

In Mark, this appears to mean "let *me* alone", "permit *me* to do this"; in Matthew, "let *it*, or *him*, alone[1]."

[1067] On the whole, it seems probable that Mark's second version of the cry, (xv. 37) *αφεις φωνῃ μεγαλῃ*, approximates to the earliest Greek tradition, but that the exact form was [λεγων] *αφεις φωνη μεγαλη*, "[saying] *Forsakest thou?* with a loud cry." This seems originally to have followed immediately after "the ninth hour" (Mk xv. 33). The extract from the 22nd Psalm appears to have been subsequently inserted as a fuller and more exact account of the "cry" (as indeed it was). But, along with this correct amplification, there were inserted, at the same time or afterwards, a number of glosses explaining the precise meaning of the words *sabach*, *azab*, or *aphes*. Some of these glosses suggested, and were developed into, a dialogue between the Roman soldiers about "*letting*" one another do, or "*desisting*" from doing, this or that. Luke and John were right in omitting this corrupt legendary dialogue. But they were

[1] **[1066** *b*] It should be added that, according to good authority (Levy i. 145 *b*) *the Greek ἄφες was adopted as a Hebrew word, meaning "leave alone"*. The sound of the Greek *aphes* appears to have suggested an identity with the Hebrew *ephes*, אפס ("end", "extremity", "point") which—somewhat like the French "point"—was used to mean "not at all" &c. Thus a comment on Ps. lxxvii. 8 "Is his mercy *clean-gone* (אפס)?" says, "The word is Greek, even as it is said (Amos vi. 10) *He said* אפס" (R.V. "he shall say, *No*") (the Heb. word denoting, first, coming to an end or cessation, and then negation). An interesting error appears to arise from the transliteration of this Hebrew word where it is applied to the *extremities* of the feet, *i.e.* "soles", or "ancles", in Ezek. xlvii. 3, "water of the *soles*," Aq., Theod. &c., "*ancles*". The LXX has "water of *forgiveness* (*ἀφέσεως*)." This exactly illustrates the hypothetical explanation given above of the interpolation in Lk. about "*forgiving*". The translator of Ezekiel took the Hebrew *ephes* to be the same as the Greek *aphes*, and interpreted the latter as an error for *aphesis*, "forgiveness": the interpolator in Lk., according to our hypothesis—if he did not derive his legend about "forgiving" from the double meaning of the Aramaic *sabach*—misinterpreted the Greek *aphes*, "abandon", as though it meant "*forgive*".

probably wrong in omitting the quotation from the Psalm, which was really uttered by our Lord.

§ 4. *"They know not what they do"*

[**1068**] This interpolation might arise in the course of a Targum protesting against the notion that Jesus called on Elijah: "Some said that He cried 'Elijah (ηλιου or ηλια), Dost thou forsake (αφεις)?', *but He cried* 'God (ηλι), *forgive* (αφες)' *and* (και) *they knew* (ἔγνωσαν) [*it*] *not.*" It has been shewn above (**937** *a*) that, in the LXX, και, "*and*", is repeatedly used to represent the Hebrew *vaw* where we should use, in English, "*but*". It must now be added that, owing to the ambiguity of the same Hebrew particle, translators might vary between "*and*" and "*for*", or "*and*" and "*but*"[1].

Moreover the past tense ἔγνωσαν may mean "*they have come to know*," practically equivalent to "*know*", as in Lk. xxiv. 18 (R.V.) "*knowest* (ἔγνως)", Jn vii. 26 (R.V.) "*know* (ἔγνωσαν)". Hence an evangelist might turn the latter part of our hypothetically suggested Targum from "*and* they *knew* [it] not," into "*for* they *know* [it] not." This might naturally be taken to be a prayer for the Roman soldiers, of whom Jesus might say, "They know not", meaning "They know not [what they are doing]." Then the bracketed words

[1] [**1068** *a*] In the following passages, A.V. has "for", but R.V. and LXX vary thus:—Gen. xiv. 13 "now", δε: xx. 6, xxiv. 65 "and", και: xxvi. 14 "and", δε: xxvi. 15 "now", και: Ex. xii. 48 "but", LXX om.: Judg. ix. 28 "but", και: 1 S. xiv. 24 (A.V.) "*for* Saul *had* adjured the people," (R.V.) "*but* S. *adjured*", LXX "*and* S. *adjureth*".

[**1068** *b*] This last passage (1 S. xiv. 24) should be carefully noted. For it shews how *the absence of a Hebrew pluperfect* (*Clue*, **241** *a*) *may combine with the ambiguity of vaw to make it doubtful whether a clause* (1) *refers parenthetically to something that had happened before the event last mentioned* (in which case *vaw* would mean "*but*", i.e. "but I ought to have mentioned" &c.), *or* (2) *describes, in chronological order, the following of one event on another* (in which case *vaw* would mean "and" or "so").

might be supplied to complete the sense. In such a development, "God" might be changed into "Father", and "cried" into "said", as being more suitable for a mediatory utterance, the result being "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

§ 5. "*Whether Elijah cometh*"

[**1069**] A Hebrew Targum "some *say* that He *called* for (אל) (**1058** *c*) Elijah" has been shewn above (**1059**) to have been capable of a Greek rendering "Some *said*, 'He *calleth* for Elijah'"; and it has been indicated that a repetition of אלי, "my God", might suggest that the first אלי was an error for אל "for". But אל might also be confused with אלו "behold": hence perhaps Mark's "*Behold*, Elijah he calleth" parallel to Matthew's "Elijah this [man][1] calleth." Moreover, "*call*" and "*come to meet*" may be rendered by the same Hebrew letters and are frequently confused in the LXX. And the much-disputed and reduplicated (*H*)*eli*, אלי, being confused with "*for*", אל, might give rise to a reading אלו New Heb. "*if only*", or the Biblical אולי (Gen. xxiv. 39 אלי) "*perhaps*". The result would be "*perhaps* (or, *what if*) *Elijah is coming-to-meet* [*him*][2]." The fact that Mark adds "to take him down" while Matthew has "to save him", suggests that there was nothing corresponding to either clause in the original, but that Mark and Matthew have severally supplied something to define the meaning. It is

[1] [**1069** *a*] The pl. of "this", אלה, would closely resemble אלו. It is just possible that Matthew's *οὗτος* may arise from some conjoint Greek and Heb. corruption. In Bibl. Heb. "behold" freq. = LXX *οὗτος* or *ὅδε*.

[2] [**1069** *b*] For קרא = "meet" see Buhl (742 *a*). In Proverbs alone, there are three instances of confusion between "*meet*" and "*call*". In Ps. lxxv. 1, Sir. xiii. 9, קרא is confused with קרב, "draw near". Such a confusion in the present context might convert "For Elijah *he doth call*" into "Behold (or, whether) Elijah *draweth near* [*to help him*]."

unsatisfactory to conclude that all the Synoptic Gospels exhibit at this point a mass of confusions, corruptions, and interpolations. But there is some compensation in the fact that, on this hypothesis, the additions peculiar to the several evangelists appear not to be inventions of their own but the result of misunderstanding quite compatible with honest attempt to ascertain the truth.

Addendum on Jewish Legend.

[**1069** (i)] The manner in which a number of legends may spring up from one or two obscure words may be illustrated by the story of the ram "*behind* (אחר)" Abraham, in the sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis (xxii. 13), where R.V. txt has "*behind*", but R.V. marg. has "*one* (אחד)" ram, and the Jerusalem Targum describes it as "a *certain* (חד) ram (דכרא) that had been created (אתברי) between the evenings of the accomplishment of the world," *i.e.* on the eve of the Sabbath. The Jerusalem Talmud (Taanith ii. 4 (Schwab vi. 157)), interpreting אחר as "*another*", says, "By the word *another*, said R. Juda b. Simon, the text means 'In *other* generations thy children will be holden by their sins'" [as the ram was "holden" in the thicket] "'.....but they will finally be delivered, thanks to the ram's horns, according to the words of Zechariah (ix. 14) *The Lord God shall blow the trumpet*'." The "trumpet", *shophar*, was identified with the "ram's horn", which was, and still is, sounded in Jewish Synagogues on New Year's Day. Another Rabbi said that Abraham saw the ram caught in a tree, a forest, a thicket (*i.e.* Babylon, Greece, and Rome) and successively freed. Professor Gollancz (*Asiatic Q. Review*, Jan. 1895, p. 143) on *The Sacrifice of Isaac*, quotes the Midrash thus: "God replied [to Abraham], 'Verily thy children will sin before me, and I shall judge

them on the [day of the] New Year—the Day of Judgment. Would they, however, seek forgiveness for their sins, let them *sound the trumpet* before me on that day'."

[**1069** (ii)] These curious traditions are not pure inventions. They can be traced, at least in part, to a textual origin. The Bib. Heb. אחר may mean (a) "*behind*", (b) "*another*". It is also easily confused with אחד, which in Bib. Heb. = *one*, but which in N. Heb. = either (c) "*one*" *or* (d) "*catch*", "*hold-fast*", and in Targ. Heb. = only (d) "*catch*", "*hold-fast*". To add to the possibilities of confusion, the Biblical text has here נאחז the Niph. of אחז, "*catch*", "*hold-fast*", for which the Targumists substitute אחיד (Part. Piel of אחד). Lastly, the Targ. Heb. for "one" is חד, or חדא, and for "behold" is הא: and these two might be confused, especially as in Onk. and Jer. the letters האד occur together (ד being the first letter of "ram"). Levy *Ch.* i. 20 says that some MSS. insert "one" חדא, or חרן "another". It would seem that (a), (b), (c), (d), might all be easily confused.

[**1069** (iii)] The rare Biblical word for a "thicket", סבך (of which the verbal form means "entangle"), is changed in the Targums to אילנא "tree". A conflation of these two terms, and the addition of a third, would facilitate, if they did not originate, the tradition above-mentioned (**1069** (i)) about the "*tree*", the "*forest*", and the "*thicket*". For example, one Rabbi might illustrate the word by Ps. lxxiv. 5 "thicket of *trees*", another by Is. ix. 18 "thickets of *the forest*." Then a third might say that the ram was caught in all the three, allegorizing as above.

[**1069** (iv)] Let us compare the full text as given in R.V. with the versions of Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum. Genes. xxii. 13 (R.V. txt) "And A. lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, a ram (איל), behind (אחר), caught (נאחז)" = Onk. "And A. lifted up his eyes *after* (בתר) *these* [*things*] (אילין), and looked, and behold, a ram (דכרא) [here the Vienna edition of 1859 repeats בתר? = *behind*, or *after*]

caught (אחיד) in a tree (אילנא)" = Jer. "And A. lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold, (lit.) a ram (דיכרא) one (חד) that was created (דאיתברי)....." Now Onkelos adheres for the most part closely to the sense of the Original, simply turning the Biblical Hebrew into New Hebrew but not adding to it; and it seems unlikely that so faithful a Targumist would make such a needless insertion as "*after these things*" out of his own head. We may therefore feel fairly confident (comp. Berliner, *Onk.* vol. i. p. 8) that Onk. means "*after these things*" to represent something in the Hebrew; and his "*after*", בתר, appears to be a New Hebrew rendering of the Biblical Hebrew אחר, "behind". But, if so, Onkelos would seem to have repeated איל, "ram", as אילין "these things", besides rendering it into the New Heb. דכרא, "ram". In other words, he commits the error,—a frequent one even in faithful translators—of conflation. The reader will note that one edition of Onk. repeats בתר at the point where the Jer. Targ. has "One that was created", חד דאיתברי. This suggests that the first impulse toward the fine poetic tradition about the "creation" (ברייה) of the ram may possibly have arisen out of some textual combination of אחד and בתר—although, in a text less corrupt, it would be more probably explained as arising merely out of a desire to define the "one ram".

[**1069** (v)] Professor Gollancz, in the article above cited, shews that Jewish literature, describing the sacrifice of Isaac, abounds with descriptions of *dialogues* preceding it,—dialogues either between God and Satan, who accuses Abraham; or between God and the ministering angels, who bring the same charge against Abraham that Satan brings; or between Ishmael and Isaac; or between Abraham and his own spirit discoursing on his own neglect of duty toward God. Most modern critics would assume off-hand that these interesting amplifications were suggested by the mere love of picturesque detail. But the assumption would be false, since the passages

shew (*e.g.* Sanhedr. 89 b) that they all sprang out of the phrase (Gen. xxi. 8) (lit.) "after these *words* (דברים)" (*i.e.* "after these *things*"). On this the Rabbis built up a number of different suggestions as to what the "*words*" might be. This, and the preceding facts (**1069** (i)—(iv)) should warn us that *in Hebrew and Jewish literature, and in any early Christian literature based on Jewish tradition, legend would probably be very largely based on plays upon words, on interchange of similar letters, and on consequent confusions, corruptions, and conflations, resulting in amplifications of the Original to an extent unparalleled in Western literature.*

APPENDIX III

THE TRANSFIGURATION AND THE AGONY CANONICAL AND NON-CANONICAL ACCOUNTS

(*Greek*)

1. The Transfiguration according to the Synoptists (txt as in W.H.) (**1070**).
2. The Agony according to the Synoptists (txt as in W.H.) (**1071**).
3. The corresponding accounts in *The Acts of John* (ed. James) (**1072—4**).
4. The Transfiguration in *The Revelation of Peter* (ed. James) (**1075**).

(1) *The Transfiguration*

Mk ix. 2—8

[**1070**] (2) Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, (3) καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

(4) καὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἠλείας σὺν Μωυσεῖ, καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Mt. xvii. 1—8

(1) Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν.

(2) καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς.

(3) καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας συνλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Lk. ix. 28—36

(28) Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι.

(29) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων.

(30) καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας.

(31) οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.

Mk ix. 2—8

(5) καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Ῥαββεί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωυσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλείᾳ μίαν.

(6) οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο.

(7) καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

(8) καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.

Mt. xvii. 1—8

(4) ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Κύριε, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωυσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλείᾳ μίαν.

(5) ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

(6) καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.

(7) καὶ προσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν, Ἐγέρθητε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

(8) ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.

Lk. ix. 28—36

(32) ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ.

(33) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ἐπιστάτα, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωυσεῖ καὶ μίαν Ἠλείᾳ, μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει.

(34) ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην.

(35) καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.

(36) καὶ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος.

(2) *The Agony*

Mk xiv. 32—43

[1071] (32) Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεί, καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Καθίσατε ὧδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι.

(33) καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάνην μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν,

(34) καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε.

(35) καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσηύχετο ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα,

(36) καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἀββά ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι· παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ.

Mt. xxvi. 36—47

(36) Τότε ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεθσημανεί, καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς Καθίσατε αὐτοῦ ἕως [οὗ] ἀπελθὼν ἐκεῖ προσεύξωμαι.

(37) καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.

(38) τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ.

(39) καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ προσευχόμενος καὶ λέγων, Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, παρελθάτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο· πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ.

Lk. xxii. 39—47

(39) Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν· ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ [καὶ] οἱ μαθηταί[1].

(40) γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν.

(41) καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν, καὶ θεὶς τὰ γόνατα προσηύχετο

(42) λέγων Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.

[[[(43) ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. (44) καὶ γενό-

[1] Lk. xxii. 39 is parallel to Mk xiv. 26, but is inserted here to give a connected sense in Lk.

Mk xiv. 32—43

(37) καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμων, καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἴσχυσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι;

(38) γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

(39) καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο [τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών].

(40) καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ἤδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.

(41) καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθεύδετε [τὸ] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν.

Mt. xxvi. 36—47

(40) καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ;

(41) γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

(42) πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο [λέγων] Πάτερ μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πίω, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου.

(43) καὶ ἐλθὼν πάλιν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι.

(44) καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο ἐκ τρίτου, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν πάλιν.

(45) τότε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς

Lk. xxii. 39—47

μενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν]].

(45) καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης,

(46) καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν.

Mk xiv. 32—43	Mt. xxvi. 36—47	Lk. xxii. 39—47
	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθεύδετε λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν.	
(42) ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν.	(46) ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με.	
(43) καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος... Ἰούδας....	(47) καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος...Ἰούδας...	(47) ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος...Ἰούδας...

(3) *Acts of John*[1]

(*a*) *The first account of the Transfiguration*

[**1072**] iii. Ἄλλοτε δέ ποτε παραλαμβάνει με καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Πέτρον εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὅπου ἦν αὐτῷ ἔθος εὔχεσθαι· καὶ εἴδομεν ἐν αὐτῷ φῶς τοιοῦτον ὁποῖον οὐκ ἐστὶν δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ χρώμενον λόγῳ φθαρτῷ ἐκφέρειν οἷον ἦν.

(*b*) *The second account of the Transfiguration*

[**1073**] iv. Πάλιν ὁμοίως ἀνάγει ἡμᾶς τοὺς τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ὄρος, λέγων· Ἔλθατε σὺν ἐμοί. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάλιν ἐπορεύθημεν· καὶ ὁρῶμεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ διαστήματος εὐχόμενον. ἐγὼ δὲ οὖν, ἐπειδὴ ἐφίλει με, ἠρέμα ὡς μὴ ὁρῶντος αὐτοῦ ἐγγίζω αὐτῷ καὶ ἵσταμαι ἀφορῶν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁρῶ αὐτὸν ἱμάτια μὲν μηδὲ ὅλως ἠμφιεσμένον, γυμνὸν δὲ τούτων ὁρώμενον ὑφ' ἡμῶν· ἄνθρωπον δὲ οὐδὲ ὅλως· καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόδας πάσης χιόνος λευκοτέρους, ὡς καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην καταλάμπεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ποδῶν· τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐρειδομένην· ὡς φοβηθέντα με κραυγάσαι, αὐτὸν δὲ ἐπιστραφέντα μικρὸν ἄνθρωπον ὀφθῆναι,...μὴ πειράζειν τὸν ἀπείραστον.

[1] The text followed here is that of Dr James, but I have occasionally deviated from it slightly in passages discussed above.

v. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ἐμοῦ ὁμιλοῦντος τῷ κυρίῳ ἠγανάκτουν διανευόμενοί μοι ὅπως παραγένωμαι πρὸς αὐτούς, ἀπολιπὼν μόνον τὸν κύριον. καὶ ἐπορεύθην, καὶ εἶπόν μοι ἀμφότεροι· Ὁ τῷ κυρίῳ προσομιλῶν μένοντι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕψους τίς ἦν; καὶ γὰρ ἠκροώμεθα ἀμφοτέρων λαλούντων. καὶ συννοήσας τὴν πολλὴν χάριν αὐτοῦ καὶ πολυπρόσωπον ἐνότητα καὶ σοφίαν ἄληκτον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀποβλέπουσαν εἶπον· Μαθήσεσθε αὐτὸ τοῦτο αὐτὸν ἐξετάσαντες.

(c) *The Agony*

[1074] vi. Πάλιν ποτὲ ἡμῶν πάντων τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ ἐν ἑνὶ καθευδόντων οἴκῳ, ἐγὼ μόνος ἀπὸ τὸ ἱμάτιον ἐντυλιξάμενος ἐπετήρουν τί πράσσει· καὶ ἤκουσα τὸ πρῶτον λέγοντος αὐτοῦ· Ἰωάννη, κάθευδε. κἀγὼ τότε προσποιησάμενος τὸν καθεύδοντα εἶδον ἄλλον ὅμοιον αὐτὸν κατελθόντα τινά, οὗ καὶ ἠκροασάμην λέγοντος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐξελέξω, ἔτι σοι ἀπιστοῦσιν; καὶ ὁ κύριός μου εἶπεν αὐτῷ Καλῶς λέγεις· ἄνθρωποι γάρ εἰσιν.

(4) *The Transfiguration in The Revelation of Peter*

[1075] ii. Καὶ προσθεὶς ὁ Κύριος ἔφη Ἄγωμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος [καὶ] εὐξώμεθα. ἀπερχόμενοι δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐδεήθημεν ὅπως δείξῃ ἡμῖν ἕνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν [τῶν] δικαίων τῶν ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί εἰσι τὴν μορφὴν, καὶ θαρσήσαντες παραθαρσύνωμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπους.

iii. Καὶ εὐχομένων ἡμῶν ἄ[φνω φαίν]ονται δύο ἄνδρες ἑστῶτες ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς ἕ[ω, οἷς] οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἀντιβλέψαι· ἐξήρχετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς [ὄ]ψεως αὐτῶν ἀκτὶν ὡς ἡλίου, καὶ φωτινὸν ἦν αὐ[τῶν ὅλον τὸ] ἔνδυμα, ὁποῖον οὐδέποτε ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθρώπ[ου εἶδεν, οὐδὲ] στόμα δύναται ἐξηγήσασθαι ἢ καρ[δία ἐκφράσα]ι τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἐνεδέδυντο, καὶ τὸ κάλ[λος τῆς προσό]ψεως αὐτῶν· οὓς ἰδόντες ἐθαμβώθημεν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ σώματα αὐτῶν ἦν λευκότερα πάσης χιόνος καὶ ἐρυθρότερα

παντὸς ῥόδου, συνεκέκρατο δὲ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν αὐτῶν τῷ λευκῷ, καὶ ἁπλῶς οὐ δύναμαι ἐξηγήσασθαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν· ἥ τε γὰρ κόμη αὐτῶν οὔλη ἦν καὶ ἀνθηρὰ καὶ ἐπιπρέπουσα αὐτῶν τῷ τε προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὤμοις, ὡσπερεὶ στέφανος ἐκ ναρδοστάχυος πεπλεγμένος καὶ ποικίλων ἀνθῶν, ἢ ὥσπερ ἶρις ἐν ἀέρι, τοιαύτη ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ εὐπρέπεια.

iv. Ἰδόντες οὖν αὐτῶν τὸ κάλλος ἔκθαμβοι γεγόναμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἐπειδὴ ἄφνω ἐφάνησαν, καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἶπον Τίνες εἰσὶν οὗτοι; λέγει μοι Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ δίκαιοι ὧν ἠθελήσατε τὰς μορφὰς ἰδεῖν. κἀγὼ ἔφην αὐτῷ Καὶ ποῦ εἰσι πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι, ἢ ποῖός ἐστιν ὁ αἰὼν ἐν ᾧ εἰσι ταύτην ἔχοντες τὴν δόξαν;

APPENDIX IV

BATH KOL IN TARGUMS AND TALMUDS

The following collection of Voices from Heaven mentioned in the Targums and Talmuds is reprinted from pp. 22—4 of Pinner's *Introduction to the Talmud*, to be found in his valuable edition of the Babylonian tractate, Berachoth, 1842, which has been long out of print. No attempt has been made by the author to annotate it—a task left to more competent hands.

בנת קלא-ברת קלא-בת קלא-בת קל-בת קול

BATH KOL, TOCHTER-STIMME, ECHO, WIEDERHALL

[1076] Einer der wichtigsten Gegenstände, der hierher gehört, ist unstreitig die nähere Auseinandersetzung des häufig im Talmud vorkommenden Ausdruckes: בת קול Bath Kol, was darunter gemeint, und wie er aufzufassen sei; und da eine solche Erklärung, wenn sie anders wahr und unwiderleglich sein soll, nur aus der Quelle selbst entnommen werden muss, so haben wir zu diesem Behufe sämmtliche Stellen, wo dieser Ausdruck im Talmud oder in den vor ihm verfassten Werken vorkommt, genau untersucht, um zu einem richtigen Resultate zu gelangen. Wir halten es daher für das Zweckmässigste, wenn wir alle diese Stellen hier mittheilen, und damit die Ansichten der ältesten und berühmtesten Rabbinen verbinden, die in Hinsicht dieses Gegenstandes aufgestellt worden sind, worauf wir dann unsere Meinung gründen.

A. תרגום יונתן בן עוזיאל *Chaldäische Uebersetzung Jonathan's, Sohnes Usiël s*

[1077] Gen. 38. 26: וברת קלא נפלת משמייא ואמרת, דמן קדמי הוה פתגמא ואשתזבו תרויהום מן דינא· Und ein Bath Kol fiel vom Himmel und sprach: Von mir ist diese Sache, und beide sind befreit vom Gerichte.—Num. 21. 6: ברת קלא נפלת מן שמי מרומא וכן אמרת, איתון חמון כל בני נשא כל טבוון דעבדית לעמא· Ein Bath Kol fiel vom Himmel und sprach: Es sahen alle Menschen, welche Wohlthaten ich diesem Volk erzeigt habe.—Deut. 28. 15: ברת קלא נפלת מן שמי מרומא וכן אמרת, לא תדחלון אבהת עלמא· Ein Bath Kol fiel vom Himmel und sprach: Fürchtet nicht, Väter der Welt!—Das. 34. 5: ברת קלא נפלת מן שמיא וכן אמרת, אתון כל עללי עלמא וחמון בצערי דמשה· Ein Bath Kol fiel vom Himmel und sprach: Es komme die ganze Welt und sehe die Leiden des Moscheh.—Prediger, 2. 14: ונפקת ברת קלא מן שמי מרומא וכן אמרת, אנת כנשתא דישראל! דמתילא ליונתא· Und es ertönte ein Bath Kol vom Himmel und sprach: Gemeine Jisraël! Du gleichst einer Taube.—Das. 4. 1: נפקת בת קלא מן שמיא וכן אמרת, כמה יאה אנת כנשתא דישראל! Ein Bath Kol ertönte vom Himmel und sprach: Wie schön bist du Gemeine Jisraël!—Klagelieder, 3. 38: על ברת קלא רמיזא Auf ein Bath Kol deutet es.—Esther, 5. 14: נפקת בת קל מן שמי מרומא ואמרת ליה, יאי המן רשיעא· Ein Bath Kol ertönte vom Himmel und sprach zu ihm: Für Haman, den Gottlosen ist es passend[1].

[1] Man findet auch im תרגום שני der zweiten chaldäischen Uebersetzung des Buches Esther viermal den Ausdruck בת קול Bath Kol, und zwar Kap. 1. 3 zweimal., woselbst auch viermal: מתיבא רוח דקודשא Es erwiederte der heilige Geist vorkommt, dann Kap. 3. 7 und 4. 1; da wir aber nur diejenige Stellen, wo Bath Kol vorkommt, hier anführen,

B. ספרא *Siphra*

[1078] Am Anfange der Paraschah שמיני Der achte, Halachah 37: בשעה שיצק משה שמן המשחה על ראש אהרן נרתע ונפל לאחוריו, אמר, אוי לי, שמעלתי בשמן המשחה! השיבתו רוח הקודש, הנה מה טוב ומה נעים שבת אחים גם יחד. Zur Zeit als Moscheh das Oel der Salbung goss auf das Haupt Aharon's, wurde er ängstlich und fiel rückwärts, indem er sagte: Wehe mir, dass ich eine Untreue begangen habe an dem Oele der Salbung! Da erwiederte ihm der heilige Geist (Psalm, 133. 1): "Siehe, wie schön und lieblich ist es, wenn Brüder zusammen wohnen[2]."

C. ספרי *Siphri*

[1079] Paraschah וזאת הברכה Und dies ist der Segen, פיסקא 357 Piska: רבי אליעזר אומר, בת קול יוצא מתוך המחנה שנים עשר מיל על שנים עשר מיל והיתה מכרזת ואומרת, מת משה. R. Elieser sagt: Ein Bath Kol ertönte durch das Lager von zwölfmal zwölf Mil und rief und sprach: Gestorben ist Moscheh. Dieselbe Stelle findet man Sotah, 13. 2.

D. משנה *Mischnah*

[1080] יבמות Jebamoth, Abs. 16, Mis. 6: משיאין אשה על פי בת קול. מעשה באחד שעמד על ראש ההר ואמר, איש פלוני בן פלוני ממקום פלוני מת, הלכו ולא מצאו שם אדם, והשיאו את אשתו. ושוב מעשה בצלמון באחד שאמר, אני איש פלוני בן איש פלוני נשבני נחש, והרי אני מת, והלכו ולא הבירוהו, והשיאו את אשתו. Man erlaubt zu heirathen

---

die entweder im Talmud oder in den frühern Werken erwähnt werden, so gehört sowohl dieses Targum als die andern מדרשים Midraschim, die erst nach dem Talmud verfasst wurden, nicht hierher.

[2] Dasselbe findet man mit dem Ausdruck Bath Kol im babyl. Talmud. Horajoth, 12. 1 und Kerithoth, 5. 2.

durch ein Bath Kol[3]. Es ereignete sich, dass Jemand stand auf dem Gipfel eines Berges und sprach: Der und der, Sohn dessen und dessen, aus dem und dem Orte, ist gestorben, und als man hinaufging und Niemanden dort fand, erlaubte man seiner Frau zu heirathen. Ein anderes mal ereignete es sich in Zalmon, dass Jemand sagte: Ich, der und der, Sohn dessen und dessen, bin von einer Schlange gebissen worden, und ich sterbe, und als man hinging und ihn nicht erkannte, erlaubte man seiner Frau zu heirathen.

[1081] אבות Aboth[4], Abs. 6, Mis. 2: אמר ר׳ יהושע בן לוי, בכל יום ויום בת קול יוצאת מהר חורב ומכרזת ואומרת, אוי להם לבריות מעלבונה של תורה. Es sagte R. Jehoschua, Sohn Lewi's: Täglich ertönt ein Bath Kol vom Berge Choreb, welches ruft und spricht: Wehe den Menschen wegen Verachtung der Schrift.

E. תלמוד ירושלמי *Jerusalemischer Talmud*

[1082] ברכות Berachoth, Abs. 1, Halachah 6: תני, יצאה בת קול ואמרה, אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים, אבל הלכה כדברי בית הלל. איכן יצאה בת קול? רב ביבי בשם ר׳ יוחנן, ביבנה יצאה בת קול. Wir haben die Lehre: Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Diese und jene sind Worte des lebenden Gottes, aber die Halachah ist nach den Worten der Schule Hillel's. Wo ertönte das Bath Kol? Rab Bibi sagte im Namen R. Jochanan's: In Jabneh ertönte das Bath Kol. Dasselbe findet man Jebamoth, Abs. 1, Hal. 6, Kidduschin, Abs. 1, Hal. 1, Sotah, Abs. 3, Hal. 4.

[1083] פיאה Peah, Abs. 1, Hal. 5: נפקת ברת קלא ואמרה, דמוך ר׳ שמואל בר רב יצחק גמול חסידא. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Gestorben ist R. Schemuel, Sohn Rab Jizchak's, der Wohlthäter. Dasselbe findet man Abodah sarah, Abs. 3, Hal. 1.

[3] Eine Frau, die von ihrem Manne verlassen ist, von dem ein Bath Kol sagt, dass er gestorben sei, darf einen andern Mann heirathen.

[4] S. Einl. 21. 2, Erl. 2.

[1084] כלאים Kilajim, Abs. 9, Hal. 3: אמרין, דילמא דחללינן שבתא, יצאתה בת קול ואמרה להן, כל מי שלא נתעצל בהספדא של רבי יהא מכושר לחיי העולם הכא, בר מן קצרא, כיון דשמע כן סליק לאיגרא וטליה גרמיה ומית, נפקא בת קלא ואמרה, ואפילו קצרא. Sie sagten[5]: Vielleicht haben wir den Sabbath entweiht, da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Jeder, der nicht müssig war bei der Trauer des Rabbi, ist würdig zum künftigen Leben, ausgenommen jener Walker[6]. Als er dies hörte, ging er auf den Boden, zerschmetterte seine Knochen und starb. Darauf ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Auch der Walker. Dasselbe findet man Kethuboth, Abs. 12, Hal. 3, und im babyl. Talmud, Kethuboth, 103. 2.

[1085] שביעית Schebiith, Abs. 9, Hal. 1: שמע ברת קלא אמרה, דימוס, ואישתיזבית. Er hörte ein Bath Kol, welches sprach: Man erbarme sich seiner, und er wurde befreit.

[1086] שבת Schabbath, Abs. 6, Hal. 9: אמר ר' אלעזר, הולכין אחר שמיעת בת קול, מה טעמא? ואוניך תשמענה דבר מאחריך לאמר זה הדרך לכו בו. Es sagte R. Elasar: Man darf sich richten nach dem, was man gehört hat vom Bath Kol[7]. Aus welchem Grunde? Aus (Jesaia, 30. 21): "Und deine Ohren werden vernehmen eine Sache hinter dir her, wie folgt: Dies is der Weg, wandelt auf ihm[8]."—Das.: אמר ר' ירמיה בן אלעזר, עתידה בת קול להיות מפוצצת באהלי צדיקים ואומרת, כל מי שפעל עם אל, יבוא ויטול שברו. Es sagte R. Jirmejah, Sohn Elasar's: Einst wird ein Bath Kol in den Zelten der Gerechten ertönen und sprechen: Jeder, der mit Gott gewirkt hat, komme und nehme seinen Lohn.

[5] Als sie bei der Beerdigung des Rabbi, welches am Freitag war, bis Sonnenuntergang verweilt hatten.

[6] Der diese ganze Nacht gearbeitet und also den Sabbath entweiht hatte, ohne um Rabbi zu trauern.

[7] Welches nicht für eine Art Zauberei zu halten sei.

[8] Eine ähnliche Stelle findet man im babylon. Talmud. Megillah, 32. 1.

[1087] חגיגה Chagigah, Abs. 2, Hal. 1: שמעתי בת קול יצאה מבית קודש הקדשים ואומרת, שובו בנים, חוץ מאלישע, שידע כחי ומרד בי. Ich hörte, dass ein Bath Kol ertönte aus dem Allerheiligsten, welches sprach (Jeremia, 3. 22): "Kehret um, Söhne," ausgenommen Elischa, der meine Kraft kennt, aber mir abtrünnig ist. Dasselbe kommt vor im babylonischen Talmud, Chagigah, 15. 1, wo אחר Acher statt אלישע Elischa steht.

[1088] מועד קטן Moëd katon, Abs. 3, Hal. 1: אמר להן ר' יהושע, אם חברים מתלחמים, אתם מה איכפת לכם? יצאה בת קול ואמרה, הלכה כר' אליעזר בני. Es sagte zu ihnen R. Jehoschua: Wenn Mitgenossen sich streiten, was wollt ihr? Da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Die Halachah ist nach R. Elieser, meinem Sohne.

[1089] תענית Taanith, Abs. 4, Hal. 5: יהב ליה חד בעוט וקטליה, מיד יצאה בת קול ואמרה, הוי רעי האליל עזבי הצאן חרב על זרועו ועל עין ימינו זרועו יבוש תיבש ועין ימינו כהה תכהה. Er gab ihm einen Stoss[9] und tödtete ihn; sogleich ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Zacharia, 11. 17): "Wehe dem nichtswürdigen Hirten, dem Vernachlässiger der Heerde; Verderben über seinen Arm und über sein rechtes Auge! Sein Arm soll verdorren und sein rechtes Auge stumpf werden."

[1090] סוטה Sotah, Abs. 7, Hal. 5: אמר ר' לוי, ביבנה הותרה הרצועה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אין לכם עסק בנסתרות. Es sagte R. Lewi: In Jabneh ist das Band gelöst worden; ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Ihr habt nichts mit Geheimnissen zu thun.—Das. Abs. 9, Hal. 12: משמתו נביאים האחרונים חגי זכריה ומלאכי פסקה מהם רוח הקודש, אף על פי כן משתמשים היו בבת קול. מעשה ששמע שמעון הצדיק בת קול יוצא מבית קודש הקדשים ואמר, נהרג גיים גוליקם ובטלו גזירותיו. מעשה שיצאו נערים להלחם באנטוכיא, ושמע

[9] Der Sohn Kosiba's dem R. Elasar.

יוחנן כהן גדול בת קול יוצא מבית קודש הקדשים ואומרת, נצחו טלייא, דאגחו קרבה באנטוכיא, וכתבו אותה העת, ונתנו בו זמן וכיוונו, שבאותו שעה היתה. מעשה שנכנסו זקינים אצל בית גדיא ביריחו, ויצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, יש ביניכם אדם אחד, ראוי לרוח הקודש, אלא שאין הדור כדיי, ונתנו עיניהם בהלל הזקן, וכשמת היו אומרים עליו, הוי עניו חסיד תלמידו של עזרא. ושוב נכנסו זקינים לעלייה ביבנה, ויצאה בת קול ואמרה להם, יש ביניכם אחד ראוי לרוח הקודש, אלא שאין הדור כדיי, ונתנו עיניהם בשמואל הקטן. Nachdem gestorben waren die letzten Propheten Chaggai, Secharjah und Maleachi, hörte auf bei ihnen der heilige Geist, aber dessenungeachtet bedienten sie sich des Bath Kol. Es ereignete sich, dass Schimeon der Gerechte hörte ein Bath Kol ertönen aus dem Allerheiligsten, welches sprach: Getödtet ist das Heer des Gulikus und aufgehoben sind seine Verordnungen. Es ereignete sich, dass Jünglinge in den Krieg nach Antiochja zogen, da hörte Jochanan der Hohepriester ein Bath Kol ertönen aus dem Allerheiligsten, welches sprach: Es haben gesiegt die Jünglinge, welche in den Krieg zogen nach Antiochja; und sie schrieben diese Stunde auf, bestimmten diese Zeit und fanden, dass es zur selben Stunde geschehen war. Es ereignete sich, dass die Aeltesten in das Haus des Gadia zu Jericho gingen, da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Ein Mann befindet sich unter euch, der würdig ist zum heiligen Geiste, aber das Zeitalter ist dazu nicht würdig, und sie richteten ihre Blicke auf Hillel den Aeltern; und als er gestorben war, sagten sie von ihm: Wehe über den demüthigen und frommen Schüler des Esra. Ein anderes Mal begaben sich die Aeltesten auf die Gallerie zu Jabneh, da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Einer ist unter euch, der würdig ist zum heiligen Geiste, aber das Zeitalter ist dazu nicht würdig, und sie richteten ihre Blicke auf Schemuel den Kleinen. Dasselbe findet man am Ende dieses Abschnittes und Abodah sarah, Abs. 3, Hal. 1 und am Ende des Tractates Horajoth; dann im babyl. Talmd. Joma,

9. 2, Sotah, 33. 1 und 48. 2, Sanhedrin, 11. 1 und מגלת תענית Megillath Taanith, Abs. 11. An allen diesen Stellen kommen mehrere abweichende Lesarten vor, deren Erörterungen nicht hierher gehören.

[1091] סנהדרין Sanhedrin, Abs. 10, Hal. 2: רבי חנניה ור׳ יהושע בן לוי, בשעה שנמנו ואמרו, שלשה מלכים וארבעה הדיוטות אין להם חלק לעולם הבא, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, המעמך ישלמנה כי מאסת (אלא) כי אתה תבחר ולא אני ומה ידעת דבר? R. Chananjah und R. Jehoschua, Sohn Lewi's, sagten: Zur Zeit als sie festsetzten und sagten: Drei Könige und vier Laien haben keinen Antheil an der künftigen Welt, ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Iob, 34. 33): "Sollte er etwa nach deinem Sinne vergelten, weil du (sie) verwirfst, dass du wählst und nicht ich; und was wüsstest du sonst zu reden?"

F. תלמוד בבלי *Babylonischer Talmud*

[1092] ברכות Berachoth, 3. 1: ואמרתי לו, שמעתי בת קול, שמנהמת כיונה ואומרת, אוי לבנים! שבעונותיהם החרבתי את ביתי ושרפתי את היכלי, והגליתים לבין האומות. Und ich sagte zu ihm: Ich hörte ein Bath Kol, girrend wie eine Taube, welches sprach: Wehe den Kindern! denn durch ihre Sünden habe ich mein Haus zerstört und meinen Tempel verbrannt, und liess sie wegführen unter die Völker.—Das. 12. 2: ורבנן אמרי, מהכא, והוקענום ליי׳ בגבעת שאול בחיר יי׳, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, בחיר יי׳. Aber die Rabbinen sagten: Von hier (2 Samuel, 21. 6): "Und wir wollen sie aufhängen für den Ewigen am Hügel Schaül's, des Erkorenen des Ewigen." Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: "Des Erkorenen des Ewigen."—Das. 17. 2: דאמר רב יהודה, אמר רב, בכל יום ויום בת קול יוצאת מהר חורב ואומרת, כל העולם כולו נזונים בשביל חנינא בני. Denn es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Rab's: Täglich ertönt ein Bath Kol vom Berge Choreb und spricht: Die ganze Welt wird ernährt um Cha-

nina, meines Sohnes willen. Dasselbe s. Taanith, 24. 2 und Chollin, 86. 1.—Das. 52. 1: ורבי יהושע היא, דאמר, אין משגיחין בבת קול. Und dies ist wie R. Jehoschua, welcher sagte: Man achtet nicht auf das Bath Kol. Dasselbe s. Erubin, 7. 1; Pesachim, 114. 1; Jebamoth, 14. 1; Baba mezia, 59. 2; Chollin, 44. 1.—Das. 61. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אשריך ר' עקיבא! שיצאה נשמתך באחד Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Wohl dir R. Akiba! denn deine Seele ging hinüber bei Echad.—Das.: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אשריך ר' עקיבא! שאתה מזומן לחיי העולם הבא. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Wohl dir R. Akiba! denn du bist bestimmt zum Leben der künftigen Welt.

[1093] שבת Schabbath, 14. 2: אמר רב יהודה, אמר שמואל, בשעה שתיקן שלמה עירובין ונטילת ידים יצתה בת קול ואמרה, בני אם חכם לבך ישמח לבי גם אני. Es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Schemuël's: Zur Zeit als Schelomoh bestimmte die sabbathlichen Verbindungen und das Waschen der Hände ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Sprüche, 23. 15): "Mein Sohn! wenn dein Herz weise ist, wird sich auch mein Herz freuen." Dasselbe s. Erubin, 21. 2.—Das. 33. 2: כל מקום, שנותנין עיניהן, מיד נשרפ, יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, להחריב עולמי יצאתם, חיזרו למערתכם. הדור אזלו איתיבו תריסר ירחי שתא, אמרי, משפט רשעים בגיהנם שנים עשר חדש, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, צאו ממערתכם. Ueberall, wohin sie[10] ihre Blicke richteten, verbrannte Alles sogleich; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Seid ihr um meine Welt zu zerstören herausgegangen, so kehret zurück in eure Höhle. Sie gingen zurück und verweilten zwölf Monate, indem sie sagten: Die Verurtheilung der Frevler in der Hölle dauert zwölf Monate; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Gehet aus eurer Höhle.—Das. 56. 2: היינו דכתיב, ובן יהונתן מריב בעל, וכי מריב בעל שמו? והלא מפיבושת שמו! אלא

[10] R. Schimeon, Sohn Jochai's, und sein Sohn R. Elasar.

מתוך שעשה מריבה עם בעליו, יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, נצא בר נצא! אמר רב יהודה, אמר רב, בשעה שאמר דוד למפיבושת, אתה וציבא תחלקו את השדה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, רחבעם וירבעם יחלקו את המלוכה. Dies ist es, was geschrieben steht (1 Chron. 9. 40): "Und der Sohn Jehonathan's war Merib Baal," hiess er denn Merib Baal? Sein Name war ja Mephiboscheth! Aber gewiss, weil er einen Zank gestiftet hat mit seinem Herrn, ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Zänker, Sohn des Zänkers! Es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Rab's: Zur Zeit als Dawid sagte zu Mephiboscheth (2 Samuel, 19. 30): "Du und Ziba, ihr sollt theilen das Feld," ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Rechabeam und Jarobeam sollen theilen das Reich. Dasselbe s. Joma, 22. 2.—Das. 88. 1: אמר רבי אלעזר, בשעה שהקדימו ישראל נעשה לנשמע יצתה בת קול ואמרה להן, מי גילה לבני רז זה, שמלאכי השרת משתמשין בו? Es sagte R. Elasar: Zur Zeit als die Israëliten voransetzten (Ex. 19. 8): "Wir wollen thun" vor: Wir wollen hören, ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Wer hat meinen Kindern dieses Geheimniss geoffenbart, dessen sich die Engel des Dienstes bedienen?—Das. 149. 2: אמר רב יהודה, אמר רב, בשעה שירד אותו רשע לגיהנם רעשו כל יורדי גיהנם, אמרו, שמא למשול עליהם הוא בא, או ליחלת כמותם הוא בא, שנאמר, גם אתה חולית כמונו אלינו נמשלת, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, ממי נעמת רדה והשכבה את ערלים. Es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Rab's: Zur Zeit als dieser Frevler[11] in die Hölle kam, bebten alle Höllenbewohner, indem sie sagten: Er käme vielleicht über sie zu herrschen, oder zu leiden wie sie; denn es heisst (Jesaia, 14. 10): "Bist auch du krank wie wir, oder willst du über uns herrschen?" Da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Ezechiel, 32. 19): "Bist du schöner als irgend einer? Fahre hinunter und lagere dich zu den Unbeschnittenen."

[11] Nebucadnezar.

[1094] עירובין Erubin, 13. 2: אמר רבי אבא, אמר שמואל, שלש שנים נחלקו בית שמאי ובית הלל, הללו אומרים, הלכה כמותינו, והללו אומרים, הלכה כמותינו, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים, והלכה כבית הלל. Es sagte R. Aba, im Namen Schemuel's: Drei Jahre stritt die Schule Schammai's mit der Schule Hillel's, diese sagten: Die Halachah ist nach uns, und jene sagten: Die Halachah ist nach uns; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Sowohl dieses als jenes sind Worte des lebenden Gottes, aber die Halachah ist nach der Schule Hillel's.—Das. 54. 2: נפקא בת קלא ואמרה ליה, ניחא לך דליספו לך ארבע מאה שני, או דתיזכו את ודרך לעלמא דאתי? אמר, דניזכו אנא ודריי לעלמא דאתי. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihm: Ist dir lieber, dass dir vierhundert Jahre vermehrt werden, oder, dass du und dein Zeitalter würdig werde der künftigen Welt? Er sagte: Möge ich und mein Zeitalter würdig sein der künftigen Welt.

[1095] חגיגה Chagigah, 13. 1: אמר רבן יוחנן בן זכאי, מה תשובה השיבתו בת קול לאותו רשע, בשעה שאמר, אעלה על במתי אב אדמה לעליון? יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, רשע בן רשע בן בנו של נמרוד הרשע. Es sagte Rabban Jochanan, Sohn Saccai's: Welche Antwort gab das Bath Kol jenem Frevler[12], als er sagte (Jesaia, 14. 14): "Steigen will ich auf die Wolkenhöhen, mich gleichstellen dem Höchsten?" Da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Frevler, Sohn des Frevlers, Enkel Nimrod's, des Frevlers.—Das. 14. 2: הלך רבי יוסי הכהן וסיפר דברים לפני רבן יוחנן בן זכאי, ואמר, אשריכם, ואשרי יולדתכם, אשרי עיני, שכך ראו! ואף אני ואתם בחלומי מסובין היינו על הר סיני ונתנה עלינו בת קול מן השמים, עלו לכאן, עלו לכאן. R. Josi der Priester ging und erzählte diese Dinge vor Rabban Jochanan, Sohne Saccai's, welcher sagte: Wohl euch, wohl euren Erzeugern, wohl den Augen, die dies gesehen! und auch ich sah im

[12] Nebucadnezar.

Traume, dass wir sassen auf dem Berge Sinai, und ein Bath Kol vom Himmel über uns ertönte: Steiget hinauf hierher, steiget hinauf hierher!

[1096] מועד קטן Moëd katon, 9. 1: אמר ר' יוחנן, אותה שנה לא עשו ישראל את יום הכיפורים, והיו דואגים ואומרים, שמא נתחייבו שונאיהם של ישראל כלייה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, כולכם מזומנים לחיי העולם הבא. Es sagte R. Jochanan: In demselben Jahre[13] haben die Israëliten das Versöhnungsfest nicht gefeiert, daher fürchteten sie und sagten: Vielleicht haben dadurch die Feinde Jisraël's[14] Ausrottung verschuldet; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen: Ihr alle seid bereit zum Leben der künftigen Welt.—Das. 16. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, רק בדבר אוריה החתי Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach (1 Könige, 15. 5): "Ausser in der Sache Urijah's, des Chitti."—Das. 18. 2: אמר רב יהודה, אמר שמואל, בכל יום ויום בת קול יוצאת ואומרת, בת פלוני לפלוני. Es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Schemuel's: Täglich ertönt ein Bath Kol und spricht: Die Tochter dessen und dessen ist bestimmt für den und den. Dasselbe findet man mit einigen Veränderungen Sotah, 2. 1 und Sanhedrin, 22. 1.

[1097] ראש השנה Rosch Haschschanah, 21. 2: ביקש קהלת להיות כמשה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, וכתוב יושר דברי אמת. Der Prediger verlangte dem Moscheh, zu gleichen; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Prediger, 22. 10): "Was geschrieben steht mit Recht sind Worte der Wahrheit."

[1098] יומא Joma, 22. 2: אמר רבי מני, בשעה שאמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא לשאול, לך והכית את עמלק, אמר, אם גדולים חטאו, קטנים מה חטאו? יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, אל תהי צדיק הרבה, ובשעה שאמר לו שאול לדואג, סוב אתה

[13] Als der Tempel eingeweiht wurde.

[14] Dieser Ausdruck ist per Euphemismum zu nehmen, indem darunter die Israëliten selbst gemeint sind.

ופגע בכהנים, יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, אל תרשע הרבה.
Es sagte R. Mani: Zur Zeit als der Heilige, gepriesen sei er! zu Schaül sprach (1 Samuel, 15. 3): "Gehe und schlage den Amalek," sagte er: Wenn die Grossen gesündigt, was haben die Kleinen verbrochen? Da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Prediger, 7. 16): "Sei nicht zu gerecht." Und zur Zeit als Schaül zu Doëg sagte (1 Samuel, 22. 18): "Tritt du hin und stosse die Priester nieder," ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm (Prediger, 7. 17): "Sei nicht zu frevelhaft."

[1099] תענית Taanith, 25. 2: מעשה ברבי אליעזר שירד לפני התיבה ואמר עשרים וארבעה ברכות, ולא נענה, ירד ר' עקיבא אחריו ואמר, אבינו מלכנו! אין לנו מלך אלא אתה, אבינו מלכנו! למענך רחם עלינו, וירדו גשמים. הוו מרנני רבנן, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, לא מפני שזה גדול מזה, אלא שזה מעביר על מידותיו, וזה אינו מעביר על מידותיו.
Es ereignete sich, dass R. Elieser hintrat vor die Lade[15] und sagte vierundzwanzig Lobsprüche, aber nicht beantwortet wurde; darauf trat R. Akiba hin und sprach: Unser Vater und König! wir haben keinen andern König als dich. Unser Vater und König! um deinetwillen erbarme dich unser, und es kam Regen. Hierüber murrten die Rabbinen, da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Nicht dass dieser grösser sei als jener, sondern dieser ist langmüthig, jener aber ist nicht langmüthig.—Das. 29. 1: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אדון זה מזומן לחיי העולם הבא.
Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Dieser Herr[16] ist bereit zum Leben in der künftigen Welt.

[1100] מגילה Megillah, 3. 1: תרגום של נביאים יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו מפי חגי זכריה ומלאכי, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, מי הוא זה, שגילה סתריי לבני אדם? עמד יונתן בן עוזיאל על רגליו ואמר, אני הוא. ועוד ביקש לגלות תרגום של כתובים,

[15] Worin die Gesetzrollen sich befanden.

[16] Ein vornehmer Römer, der, um den Rabban Gamliel zu retten, sein Leben hingab.

יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, דייך. Die chaldäische Uebersetzung der Propheten hat Jonathan, Sohn Usiël's, mitgetheilt durch den Ausspruch Chaggai's, Secharjah's und Maleachi's; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Wer ist es, der meine Geheimnisse den Menschen offenbart? Da trat Jonathan, Sohn Usiël's, auf und sagte: Ich bin es. Auch suchte er die chaldäische Uebersetzung der Hagiographen zu offenbaren; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Du hast genug.—Das. 12. 1: אמר רבא, יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, ראשונים כלו מפני כלים ואתם שונים בהם? Es sagte Raba: Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihnen: Die Vormaligen sind vernichtet worden wegen der Geräthe[17], und ihr lehrt durch sie[18]?—Das. 29. 1: דרש בר קפרא, מאי דכתיב, למה תרצדון הרים גבנונים? יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, למה תרצו דין עם סיני? כולכם בעלי מומין אתם אצל סיני! Es erklärte der Sohn Kapara's: Was bedeutet, das geschrieben steht (Psalm, 68. 17): "Warum eifert ihr höckerige Berge?" Nämlich ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihnen: Warum rechtet ihr mit Sinai? Ihr alle seid ja Krüppel gegen Sinai!

[1101] כתובות Kethuboth, 77. 2: אמר ליה, הב לי סכינאי, לא הוה קא יהיב ליה, נפקא בת קלא ואמרה ליה, הב ניהליה. Er sagte zu ihm: Gieb mir mein Messer. Er gab es ihm nicht; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Gieb es ihm.—Das. 104. 1: בשעת פטירתו של רבי, זקף עשר אצבעותיו כלפי מעלה, אמר, רבונו של עולם! גלוי וידוע לפניך, שיגעתי בעשר אצבעותי בתורה, ולא נהניתי אפילו באצבע קטנה, יהי רצון מלפניך, שיהא שלום במנוחתי, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, יבוא שלום ינוחו על משכבותם. In der Sterbestunde des Rabbi, richtete er seine zehn Finger gen oben und sagte: Herr der

[17] Nämlich die Nachkommen des Nebucadnezar sind vertilgt worden, weil sie die Geräthe des Tempels zum gewöhnlichen Gebrauche genommen hatten.

[18] Wie man sie gebrauchen soll.

Welt! es ist offenbar und bekannt vor dir, dass ich mich mit meinen zehn Fingern um das Gesetz bemüht habe, ohne dass ich auch nur für die Mühe des kleinsten Fingers einen Genuss gehabt hätte, es sei wohlgefällig vor dir, dass Friede wohne in meiner Ruhe; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Jesaia, 57. 2): "Er geht ein zum Frieden, sie ruhen (dort) auf ihren Lagern."

[1102] גיטין Gittin, 56. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, בריה קלה יש בעולמי ויתוש שמה. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihm[19]: Ein kleines Geschöpf ist in meiner Welt, Jatusch ist sein Name.—Das. 57. 2: אף היא עלתה לגג ונפלה ומתה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אם הבנים שמחה. Auch sie[20] ging auf das Dach, stürzte hinunter und starb; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Psalm, 113. 9): "Die Mutter der Söhne frohlocket."

[1103] סוטה Sotah, 10. 2: כיון שהודה ואמר, צדקה ממני, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אתה הצלת תמר ושני בניה מן האור, חייך! שאני מציל בזכותך שלשה מבניך מן האור, מאן נינהו? חנניה מישאל ועזריה. צדקה ממני, מנא ידע? יצתה בת קול ואמרה, ממני יצאו כבושים. Als er[21] bekannte und sagte (Gen. 38. 26): "Sie ist gerecht, von mir," ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Du hast Tamar und ihre beiden Söhne vom Feuer gerettet, so wahr du lebst! dass auch ich wegen deines Verdienstes drei deiner Söhne vom Feuer retten werde. Wer sind sie? Chananjah, Mischaël und Asarjah[22]. "Sie ist gerecht, von mir," woher wusste er dies? Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Von mir sind ausgegangen die Eroberer[23]. —Das. 21. 1: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אם יתן איש את כל הון

[19] Zum Titus, während der Zerstörung Jerusalems.

[20] Die Mutter, welche bei der Zerstörung Jerusalems sieben Söhne auf schreckliche Weise verloren hatte.

[21] Jehudah.

[22] S. Daniel, 3. 8 bis 30.

[23] Der Welt, nämlich Salomoh und Messias. S. רש"י Raschi in Maccoth, 23. 2, wo diese Stelle ebenfalls vorkommt. Eine ähnliche Stelle

ביתו באהבה בוז יבוזו לי. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach (Hohelied, 8. 7): "Gäbe ein Mann das ganze Vermögen seines Hauses um die Liebe hin, so wäre es mir eine Verachtung."

[1104] בבא מציעא Baba mezia, 59. 2: חזר ואמר להם, אם הלכה כמותי, מן השמים יוכיחו, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, מה לכם אצל רבי אליעזר? שהלכה כמותו בכל מקום, עמד רבי יהושע על רגליו ואמר, לא בשמים היא, אין אנו משגיחין בבת קול, שכבר כתוב בהר סיני, אחרי רבים להטות. Wiederum sagte er zu ihnen: Wenn die Halachah nach mir ist, so möge man vom Himmel entscheiden; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Was habt ihr gegen R. Elieser? denn die Halachah ist überall nach ihm. Da stand R. Jehoschua auf und sagte: Nicht dem Himmel gehört sie an, wir achten nicht auf das Bath Kol; denn längst schon ist geschrieben auf dem Berge Sinai (Ex. 23. 2): "Nach der Menge ist (das Gesetz) zu beugen."—Das. 85. 1: כסבורים העם לומר, שזה גדול מזה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, לא מפני שזה גדול מזה, אלא זה היה בצער מערה, וזה לא היה בצער מערה. Das Volk war der Meinung zu behaupten, dass jener grösser sei als dieser; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Nicht jener war grösser als dieser, sondern jener war dem Leiden der Höhle unterworfen[24], dieser aber war nicht dem Leiden der Höhle unterworfen.—Das. Seite 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, תורה כמותו פלפלת, תורה כמותו לא ריבצת. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu

---

findet man im jerusalemischen Talmud. Tractat Sotah, Abs. 9, Hal. 6, wo aber der Ausdruck: ורוח הקודש אמר Und der heilige Geist sprach steht. Auch in derselben Mischnah findet man diesen Ausdruck, ferner im ספרי Siphri פיסקא Piska 305 und 355 sechsmal, dann auch Sotah, 11. 1. Wir übergehen diese Stellen, da wir uns streng an den Ausdruck: בת קול Bath Kol halten, und nur aus dem ספרא Siphra haben wir eine solche Stelle angeführt. S. Einleitung, Fol. 22. 2, Erl. 2.

[24] R. Elasar lebte dreizehn Jahre in einer Höhle, darum war er heiliger als sein Sohn R. Josi, von dem hier die Rede ist. S. Schabbath, 33. 2.

ihm: Das Gesetz hast du zwar mit Scharfsinn behauptet wie dieser, aber nicht eben so gelehrt hast du es[25].—Das. 86. 1: כי הוה קא ניחא נפשיה, אמר, טהור טהור, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אשריך רבה בר נחמני! שגופך טהור ויצתה נשמתך בטהור. Als seine Seele in Ruhe ging, sagte er: Rein, rein; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Wohl dir Rabbah, Sohn Nachmeni's! denn dein Körper ist rein und deine Seele ist ausgegangen in Reinheit.

[1105] בבא בתרא Baba bathra, 3. 2: יומא חד שמע ההוא גברא בת קלא דאמר, כל עבדא דמריד השתא מצלח. Eines Tages hörte dieser Mann ein Bath Kol, welches sprach: Jeder Sklave, der sich jetzt empört, wird beglücken.—Das. 58. 1: כי מטא למערתא דאדם הראשון יצתה בת קול ואמרה, נסתכלת בדמיה דיוקני, בדיוקני עצמה אל תסתכל. Als er zur Höhle des ersten Menschen kam, ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: Du hast gesehen das, was dem Ebenbilde gleicht, aber das Ebenbild selbst[26] darfst du nicht sehen.—Das. 73. 2: ואמרינן, ליכא מיא ובעינן ליחות, לאקורי נפשין, ונפקא בת קלא ואמר לן, לא תיחותו הכא, דנפלה ליה חציצא לבר נגרא הא שב שני, ולא קא מטיא אארעא. Wir sagten: Hier ist kein Wasser und wollten hingehen, um uns abzukühlen; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu uns: Gehet nicht hierher, denn bereits vor sieben Jahren ist das Beil eines Zimmermannes hineingefallen, und noch hat es den Boden nicht erreicht.—Das. 74. 2: נפק בת קלא אמר לן, מאי אית לכו בהדי קרטליתא? Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu uns: Was wollt ihr mit diesem Kasten?

[1106] עבודה זרה Abodah sarah, 10. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, קטיעה בר שלום מזומן לחיי העולם הבא. Ein Bath

[25] An andere, wie R. Chija es gethan hat.

[26] Nämlich den ersten Menschen, der im Ebenbilde Gottes erschaffen wurde.

Kol ertönte und sprach: Ketiah, Sohn Schalom's, ist bereit zum Leben der künftigen Welt.—Das. 17. 1: אמר, אין הדבר תלוי אלא בי, הניח ראשו בין ברכיו וגעה בבכיה, עד שיצתה נשמתו, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, ר' אלעזר בן דורדיא מזומן לחיי העולם הבא. Er sagte: Von keinem andern hängt die Sache ab als von mir; er legte sein Haupt zwischen seine Kniee und schrie weinend so lange bis seine Seele hinüberging; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach: R. Elasar, Sohn Dordia's, ist bereit zum Leben der künftigen Welt.—Das. 18. 1: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, ר' חנינא בן תרדיון וקלצטונירי מזומנין הן לחיי העולם הבא. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: R. Chanina, Sohn Teradjon's, und der Statthalter sind bereit zum Leben der künftigen Welt.

[1107] סנהדרין Sanhedrin, 39. 2: אמר ליה, שמא לא ירא אלהים אתה? יצתה בת קול ואמרה, ועובדיהו היה ירא את יי' מאוד, אבל ביתו של אחאב אינו מזומן לברכה. Er sagte zu ihm[27]: Vielleicht bist du nicht gottesfürchtig; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (1 Könige, 18. 3): "Und Obadjahu fürchtete den Ewigen sehr," aber das Haus Achab's ist nicht bereit zum Segen.—Das. 94. 1: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, רזי לי רזי לי, אמר נביא, אוי לי אוי לי, עד מתי? יצתה בת קול ואמרה, בוגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach (Jesaia, 24. 16): "Bei mir ist das Geheimniss, bei mir ist das Geheimniss." Der Prophet sagte (Das.): "Wehe mir, wehe mir, bis wie lange?" Da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Das.): "Räuber rauben, und Raub rauben Räuber."—Das. 96. 2: אמר, מסתפינא, דלא ליעבדו בי, כי היכי דעבדו בסנחריב, נפקא קלא ואמר, שוור בר שוור, נבוזראדן שוור, דמטא זמנא, דמקדשא חרוב והיכלא מיקלי. קא זיחא דעתיה, נפקא בת קלא ואמרה ליה, עמא קטילא קטלת, היכלא

[27] Achab zu Obadjahu.

קליא קלית, קימחא טחינא טחינת. Er sagte[28]: Ich fürchte, dass sie mit mir so verfahren werden, wie sie mit Sancherib verfuhren; da ertönte eine Stimme und sprach: Springer, Sohn des Springers, Nebuseradan! springe, denn die Zeit ist gekommen, dass das Heiligthum zerstört und der Tempel verbrannt werde. Hierauf wurde er stolz; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihm: Ein getödtetes Volk hast du getödtet, einen verbrannten Tempel verbrannt und gemahlenes Mehl gemahlen.—Das. 99. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו, תשב באחיך תדבר בבן אמך תתן דופי אלה עשית והחרשתי דמית היות אהיה כמוך אוכיחך ואערכה לעיניך. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihm[29] (Psalm, 50. 20 und 21): "Du sitzest da, redest gegen deinen Bruder, hängest dem Sohne deiner Mutter Makel an." "Solches hast du gethan und ich schwieg, da meintest du, ich sei dir gleich. Ich verweise es dir und stelle es dir vor Augen."—Das. 102. 1: לכן תתני שלוחים על מורשת גת בתי אכזיב לאכזב למלכי ישראל, אמר ר' חנינא בר פפא, יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, מי שהרג את הפלשתי והוריש אתכם גת תתני שלוחים לבניו בתי אכזיב לאכזב למלכי ישראל. "Darum[30] weil ihr Boten bestimmt gegen den, der Gath vererbt hat und dessen Häuser verläugnet gegen die Könige Jisraël's, sollt ihr Lügnern zu Theil werden." Es sagte R. Chanina, Sohn Papa's: Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach zu ihnen: Weil ihr gegen die Söhne dessen, der den Pelischti getödtet[31] und euch Gath als Erbtheil verschafft hat, Boten bestimmt, und dessen Häuser verläugnet gegen die Könige Jisraël's[32], sollt ihr Lügnern[33] anheimfallen.

[28] Nebuseradan, Feldherr des Nebucadnezar, als ihm die Einnahme Jerusalems nicht gelingen wollte.

[29] Zu Menascheh, Sohne Chiskijah's.

[30] S. Micha, 1. 14.

[31] Nämlich David, der den Goliath getödtet hat.

[32] Indem sie die Nachkommen David's verliessen und andere als Könige einsetzten.

[33] Fremden Mächten.

—Das. 104. 2: אמר רב יהודה, אמר רב, בקשו עוד למנות אחד, יצתה בת קול ואמרה להם, חזית איש מהיר במלאכתו לפני מלכים יתיצב בל יתיצב לפני חשוכים, מי שהקדים ביתי לביתו, ולא עוד, אלא שביתי בנה בשבע שנים וביתו בנה בשלש עשרה שנה, לפני מלכים יתיצב, בל יתיצב לפני חשוכים, ולא השגיחו עליה, יצתה בת קול ואמרה, המעמך ישלמנה כי מאסת כי אתה תבחר ולא אני? Es sagte Rab Jehudah, im Namen Rab's: Sie[34] wollten noch einen darunter zählen[35]; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach zu ihnen (Sprüche, 22. 29): "Siehst du einen Mann geübt in seiner Kunst; vor Könige stelle er sich, aber er stelle sich nicht vor Finsterlinge." Wer mein Haus dem seinigen vorgezogen, und nicht dies allein, sondern mein Haus in sieben Jahren, das seinige aber erst in dreizehn Jahren gebaut hat, der muss sich vor Könige[36] stellen, aber er darf sich nicht stellen vor Finsterlinge[37]. Allein sie achteten nicht darauf; da ertönte ein Bath Kol und sprach (Iob, 34. 33): "Sollte er etwa nach deinem Sinne vergelten, weil du (ihn) verwirfst, dass du wählst[38], und nicht ich?" (Eine ähnliche Anwendung dieses Verses s. oben S. 23. 1.)

[1108] מכות Maccoth, 23. 2: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, אני עד בדבר זה. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Ich bin Zeuge in dieser Sache.—Das.: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, היא אמו. Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Diese ist seine Mutter.

[1109] חולין Chollin, 87. 1: יצתה בת קול ואמרה, כוס של ברכה שוה ארבעים זהובים Ein Bath Kol ertönte und sprach: Ein Glas des Segenspruches ist werth vierzig Gulden.

---

[34] Die Weisen.

[35] Unter den Königen, die keinen Theil an der künftigen Welt haben, nämlich den Salomoh.

[36] Im Paradiese.

[37] Die in der Hölle leiden.

[38] Wer des künftigen Lebens würdig sei.

Erklärungen über בת קול *Bath Kol*

[1110] רש"י Raschi. סוטה Sotah, 33. 1: בת קול, אותה מדה, יודעת בשבעים לשונות, מפני שעשוי להשמיע, והיא משתלחת לכל הלשונות, פעמים לזה ופעמים לזה. Bath Kol ist diejenige göttliche Eigenschaft, die siebenzig Sprachen versteht, weil sie bestimmt ist, gehört zu werden, und in allen Sprachen gebraucht wird, bald für diesen, bald für jenen.

[1111] תוספות Tosephoth. סנהדרין Sanhedrin, 11. 1: יש אומר, שלא היו שומעין קול היוצא מן השמים, אלא מתוך אותו קול יוצא קול אחר, כמו פעמים שאדם מכה בכח ושומע קול אחר היוצא ממנו למרחוק, ואותו קול היו שומעין, לכך קורין אותו בת קול. Der eine erklärt, dass man nicht die Stimme selbst, die vom Himmel kam, gehört habe, sondern durch diese Stimme eine andere entstanden sei, wie zuweilen, wenn Jemand kräftig aufschlägt, eine andere Stimme dadurch in der Ferne gehört wird, und nur eine solche Stimme hat man gehört, deshalb nennt man sie Bath Kol.

[1112] רמ"בם R. Moscheh, Sohn Maimon's, in מורה נבוכים Moreh Nebochim, Theil 2, Kap. 42: תדע, שהגר המצרית אינה נביאה, ולא מנוח ואשתו נביאים, כי זה הדבור אשר שמעוהו, או שעלה בדעתם, הוא כדמות בת קול, אשר זכרוה החכמים תמיד, והוא עניין אחד ילוה לאיש שאינו מזומן, ואמנם יטעה בזה שתוף השם. Wisse, dass Hagar, die Aegypterin, war keine Prophetin, und Manoach und seine Frau waren keine Propheten; denn das, was sie gehört oder sich eingebildet haben, war ähnlich dem Bath Kol, welches die Weisen häufig erwähnen, und dies ist eine Sache, die sich Jemandem ereignen kann, der nicht vorbereitet ist, wobei aber die Verbindung des Namens irre leiten kann.

[1113] ר' יהודה הלוי R. Jehudah der Lewi in כוזרי Cosari, Abschnitt 3, Rede 41: כי הסנהדרין היו מצווים לדעת

כל החכמות, כל שכן שלא נסתלקה מהם הנבואה, או מה שעמד במקומה מבת קול. Denn die Männer des Sanhedrin mussten in allen Wissenschaften unterrichtet sein, zumal, da die Prophezeihung von ihnen nicht gewichen war, oder was deren Stelle vertrat, nämlich das Bath Kol. S. Rede 11 und 73, wo eine ähnliche Erklärung gegeben wird.

[1114] ר׳ בחיי R. Bechaje, פרשת Paraschah וזאת ודע, כי ארבעה הברכה Dies ist der Segen. Fol. 243, 2: מדרגות הן בנבואה, בת קול, אורים ותומים רוח הקודש, נבואה, ויש סוד במה שאמר בת קול, ולא אמר בן קול, לפי שהקול הזה המגיע לאזני השומע, הוא נמשך מאותו הקול, שכתוב בו, והיה אם שמוע תשמע בקול י׳ אלהיך, והקול הזה הנשמע נקרא בת, לפי שהוא נמשך מאותו קול. Wisse, dass es vier Grade der Prophezeihung giebt: Bath Kol, Urim und Tumim, heiligen Geist und Prophezeihung; auch liegt darin etwas Wichtiges, dass es heisst Bath Kol (Tochter-Stimme) und nicht Ben Kol (Sohnes-Stimme), weil diese Stimme, die zu den Ohren dessen, der sie hörte, drang, von derjenigen Stimme herrührte, von der geschrieben steht (Deut. 28. 1): "Und es wird geschehen, wenn du hörest auf die Stimme des Ewigen, deines Gottes," daher wird diese Stimme Tochter genannt, weil sie aus jener Stimme entstand. Auf ähnliche Weise wird Bath Kol erklärt von רל״בנ R. Lewi, Sohn Gerschon's, 2 Samuel, 1. 27. ריקנאטי Rekanate, פרשת Paraschah וארא Ich bin erschienen. Fol. 83, S. 2. תוספות יום טוב Tosephoth des R. Jom Tob in Jebamoth, Abs. 16, Mis. 6, nach welchem es deshalb בת קול Bath Kol, Tochter-Stimme heisst, um anzudeuten, dass es ein geringerer Grad der Prophezeihung sei. R. Eliah in תשבי Tischbi fügt einer ähnlichen Erklärung hinzu: ובעלי הקבלה אומרים, שהוא קול של מדה אחת, הנקראת קול Die Kabbalisten sagen, dass dies eine Stimme von derjenigen göttlichen Eigenschaft sei, die Kol genannt wird.

[1115] Aus den angeführten Stellen des Talmud, in

welchen der Ausdruck: בת קול Bath Kol vorkommt, wie aus den mitgetheilten Erklärungen der berühmtesten Rabbinen geht hervor, dass unter Bath Kol keine andere Stimme gemeint sei als eine rein göttliche, die man in der That gehört hat, die entweder direkt vom Himmel kam, oder aus einer göttlichen entstanden war, also indirekt vom Himmel kam. Dafür sprechen nicht nur diejenige Stellen, worin es heisst: Wo ertönte das Bath Kol? Und: Dass seitdem die Prophezeihung oder der heilige Geist aufgehört hatte, man sich des Bath Kol bediente, oder davon Gebrauch machte, sondern bei weitem mehr jene, in welchen es heisst, dass das Bath Kol einen Vers gesprochen habe, und zwar zu einer Zeit, in welcher noch Prophezeihungen stattgefunden haben, welches, wie aus den Stellen zu entnehmen ist, mehr als dreissigmal der Fall war. Dass alle diese Stellen zur Haggadah und nicht zur Halachah gehören, und also den eigenthümlichen Forschungen und Beurtheilungen unterworfen sind, wie die Haggadah selbst; ferner, dass man nach dem Ausspruche eines Bath Kol keine Halachah bestimmen darf, ist nicht Gegenstand unserer vorliegenden Untersuchung; eben so wenig ist hier der Ort auseinander zu setzen, woher es komme, dass fast die meisten dieser Stellen vom R. Jehudah, im Namen Rab's oder Schemuel's, mitgetheilt wurden; denn nur die wesentliche Bestimmung des Bath Kol, und was die Talmudisten darunter gemeint haben, soll hier gezeigt werden, und dieses ist wie gesagt, und wie aus Allem klar hervorleuchtet, nichts Anderes, als eine wahre göttliche Stimme, die mittel- oder unmittelbar zu den Menschen drang. Nur muss man wohl unterscheiden die Stellen, wo der Ausdruck Bath Kol nur bildlich für eine innere Stimme gebraucht wird, von denjenigen, in welchen von einem wirklichen Bath Kol die Rede ist; so wird in der angeführten Mischnah aus Jebamoth, im jerusalemischen Talmud, Tractat Schabbath, Abs. 6, Hal. 9, im babylonischen Talmud, Tractat Megillah, 32. 1, dieser Ausdruck nur bildlich gebraucht.

APPENDIX V

"THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST PETER"

CONTRASTED WITH

"THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN"

§ 1. *The one point of similarity, the claim of both to have "seen" or "heard"*

[**1116**] The spuriousness of this Epistle has been so fully demonstrated by Dr Chase in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*[1], that I should be content simply to refer my readers to his article, but for the fact that, in the attempt to give full and fair representation to the arguments on the other side for the genuineness of the Epistle—mostly special pleading of a very flimsy and unscholarlike nature—the author has been compelled to enter into such minute detail that some may perhaps fail to appreciate the crushing force of his demonstration when taken as a whole. I shall therefore attempt to re-state some of the facts that tell against the Epistle.

[**1117**] The reason for this digression in a note on the Fourth Gospel may not be at once apparent. And there is little indeed that the Epistle and the Gospel have in common; but they have this one point, that both of them represent their respective writers as having "seen" or "heard" what

[1] Vol. iii. 796—813

(according to our belief) they did *not* "see" or "hear". Moreover, what they profess to have severally seen is of a very sacred nature: in the Epistle, the Transfiguration, in the Gospel, the blood and water flowing from Christ's side; and this, for some modern readers, seems to stamp both writers as equally guilty of falsehood of a particularly odious description. The Evangelist, it is true, only *implies* that he was John, whereas the letter-writer plainly *asserts* himself at the outset to be "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ," and keeps up the fiction—not indeed successfully but at all events pertinaciously, to the end of the letter, where he patronizes the Apostle of the Gentiles as "our beloved brother Paul." But this may seem to make matters no better—perhaps even worse—for the writer of the Gospel, at all events in the eyes of those who agree with Charles Lamb in disliking "your hesitating half story tellers who go on sounding your belief," and in preferring one who "did not stand shivering upon the brink but was a hearty thorough-paced liar, and plunged at once into the depths of your credulity." It must be admitted, then, that there is against the author of the Fourth Gospel a *prima facie* and plausible case for including him in the condemnation justly pronounced upon the author of the Epistle; and I desire to argue in arrest of such a judgment.

[**1118**] Not that I would conceal my regret that the Evangelist has not seen his way to be more exact in distinguishing John's part in originating the Gospel from his own in preaching and writing it. This, I think, might have been done, somewhat after the fashion—though by the way of contraries—in which the humble Tertius claims his part in a Pauline letter: "I, Tertius, who write the Epistle." According to our hypothesis, the man that developed and finally committed to writing the Fourth Gospel, possibly originated by the son of Zebedee, was much more than an amanuensis: but still, in place of the text as it stands (Jn xxi. 24 "This is the disciple that beareth witness of these things and wrote

these things") he might have said something of this kind: "This is the disciple that taught these things, John the son of Zebedee, sometime Bishop of Ephesus: and I, who consider myself but his amanuensis, after having taught them for such and such a number of years after his death, am now writing them down at the request of the Elders."

§ 2. *Yet the Evangelist is a true Prophet*

[**1119**] This would have been (according to our hypothesis), from the modern and historical point of view, very much better: and I admit that it was a fault to say that the disciple that "*witnessed*" was also the disciple that "*wrote*". But still it may be contended that this fault proceeded from an excess of pious devotion in a noble and prophetic nature, merging its own individuality in the person of "*the beloved disciple*", upon whom his eyes were constantly fixed as the mirror of the Love of Christ. Taken as a whole, the Gospel reveals a writer imbued with a message of Light, Life, and Truth, which message he must needs give in his own way. It is not at all our way. It is not such as we might have expected from an ordinary prophet of Light: it is far from being clear, direct, and pointed like the short Synoptic sayings of Christ. It is as though the writer felt darkened by excess of illumination. Or else he writes under the conviction that the light cannot be *poured* into his readers, but must be *drawn in* by some act on their part; and his first point is to ensure their co-operation. He appears sometimes to go out of his way to be ambiguous. He is always mystical, always fraught with a two-fold or manifold meaning, as though he said, "You shall not go a step with me unless you will think for yourselves." Sometimes he seems to meander in long discourses or dialogues. He repeats the same things positively and negatively, other things with a two-fold, others with

a three-fold, testimony: there are also instances of sevenfold reiteration, and the Gospel begins and ends with a sabbatical arrangement[1].

[1120] Indeed, in some respects, the style is as complicated as a sonnet; and we feel beneath it the influence of the allegorizing School of Philo and of Jewish canons about the methods of stating terrestrial and celestial doctrine. But, underlying all this Philonian or Alexandrian art, which has become with him a second nature, there is something that is not Philonian at all—a fervent belief that God could become, and has become, incarnate for the redemption of man in Jesus Christ, and that His Spirit, moving upon the face of the waters of humanity, is to create order out of trouble, and to renew mankind in the likeness of God. This is his message of Truth, and he is wholly possessed by it as a Prophet should be. In matters of detail he might go wrong—probably he knew he *must* go wrong, for there were not the means of going right—but the Law of human nature, the conformation of man to God, the identity between what is righteous and what is divine, this was his Truth, and he loved it as he loved God, and hated all contradictions of it as the brood of Satan.

§ 3. *The Letter-writer has no prophecy of his own*

[1121] From the Evangelist we pass to the letter-writer and his apostolic claims. First, what has he to say that is at all worth saying? Secondly, in what spirit does he say what he actually says?

What he has to say refers less to Christ than to other subjects—except in the first chapter, and there mostly in formal phrases or in the allusion to the Voice at the Transfiguration, which the writer claims to have heard[2]. The

[1] See Westcott on Jn xii. 1, "His Gospel begins and closes with a sacred week."

[2] 2 Pet. i. 17—18.

Epistle of St James, however, shews that a letter may seldom mention Christ and yet be very Christian in spirit and contain passages of apostolic fervour. But this Epistle is not Christian in spirit, much less apostolically Christian. If it is the sign of an Apostle to draw us closer to our Redeemer, to quicken our sense of the debt we owe Him, and to breathe into our lethargic souls something of His strengthening and purifying Spirit—then an Apostle this man is not. He deals with many subjects, and now and then gives us a phrase or two of beauty, but seldom or never what may be called an apostolic passage. As to prophecy, for example, he tells us briefly that it is, or was, like a lamp shining in a gloomy place till the day-star appear, that it was confirmed by the Voice from Heaven, and that it is not "of private interpretation"[1]. But his meaning is not quite clear; and this part of his Epistle reads as though it had been taken out of some frame-work where it had a sense that is now lost or obscured.

[**1122**] In the condemnation of heretics he is copious, and in depicting the endless punishments that await them. He also informs us that the world was made out of water, and is to be destroyed by fire; on which last point he enlarges with tedious iteration. He is most practical when he cautions his readers against inferring that, because the end of the world is delayed, it will never come; and his most moral passage is a commendation of Christian qualifications (curiously differing from N.T. vocabulary) beginning with "faith" and "virtue", and ending with "*love of the brethren*" and "*love*". But in all this there is no Christ—unless a mere list of Christian qualifications can be taken to represent Him—and no Spirit of Christ, nothing that marks a prophet, or an apostle. It is wholly different from St Peter's First Epistle.

[1] See **1135***a*, quoting Philo i. 510, "The prophet utters nothing [of] private [utterance]." If the writer is borrowing from Philo he has turned a straightforward and intelligible sentence into one that has given commentators a great deal of trouble and has never been satisfactorily explained.

§4. *He has no style of his own*

[**1123**] Next, as regards the style and spirit in which he says what he has to say. Dr Chase has compiled a long list of rare and curious words and expressions differentiating him from any other New Testament writer. Few of these are taken from the LXX, which, though copiously quoted in the First Epistle of St Peter, is hardly used at all by our author[1]. He is conclusively demonstrated to have extracted liberally from Jude; Dr Chase also indicates a likelihood that the work perhaps borrows from, but is more probably akin to, a second-century apocryphal work called the Apocalypse of Peter; and Professor Deissmann calls attention to a remarkable group of similarities between the Epistle and a Carian inscription (probably written in the first half of the first century) decreeing processions and offerings to Zeus and Hecate.

[**1124**] When a literary man pilfers in this indiscriminate way, one is rarely safe in asserting that he stole this particular phrase or passage from that particular source; for he may have stolen at second-hand, taking it from somebody who took it from that source. Hence Prof. Deissmann is well-advised in not committing himself to the conclusion that the Epistle-writer borrowed from the Carian inscription. More probably the inscription used certain expressions, common in decrees of this kind, and Pseudo-Peter borrowed, not from one such decree, but from the class. This however makes no difference as to our argument. The point for us, at present, is that styles so varied as that of Jude, the Pseudo-Apocalypse, and the heathen Inscription, are all to be found in this Epistle, and that this extraordinary mixture indicates the work to be spurious.

---

[1] [**1123***a*] See Hastings' *Dict.* vol. iii. 807 *a* : "The Epistle contains no formal quotation from the O.T. W.H. use uncial type only in five places.... But in none of these passages is the resemblance of language so close as to make the reference to the LXX. certain."

[**1125**] Why could not the writer be content to say what he had to say in language of his own? The answer is two-fold. In the first place he has a very imperfect mastery of Greek, as is apparent from his use, or non-use, of the particles, and from his general misuse of word and idiom. But this is not a sufficient answer. John the son of Zebedee, the author (according to Irenaeus) of the Book of Revelation, writes most barbaric Greek; but it is always clear, never contemptible; and for the most part one forgets the roughness of the dialect in the vividness and force of the thought. This man might have written in the same way, or in a corresponding way of his own, if he had been a real apostle: but being a false apostle, destitute of original thought, given to bombastic inanities, and of an essentially vulgar, tawdry, and dishonest mind, he instinctively seeks to disguise his own spiritual nakedness by stealing patches from others—sometimes from prophets, but at other times from mere weavers of words, since words were his delight.

§ 5. *He writes artificially and grandiloquently*

[**1126**] Hence this one short Epistle supplies more instances (probably) than could be found in the whole of the Pauline Epistles of out-of-the-way, grandiloquent, and what may be called ambitious words. Sometimes the writer prefers a long sonorous word to a short and simple one, even though the latter has received the sanction of our Lord's own usage. For example, Christ spoke of "*Hades*", but Pseudo-Peter speaks of "consigning to *Tartarus*": the New Testament speaks of "*children of God*", or "*begotten of God*", but this pseudo-apostle, aping Greek philosophy, gives us "*partakers of the divine nature*". St Paul once, and only once, bids his disciples take account of "*virtue*"[1], where Lightfoot paraphrases thus: "Whatever value may reside in your old

[1] Phil. iv. 8.

heathen conception of virtue"; and this is the only use of the word by an Apostle or Evangelist (speaking in his own person[1]) in N.T. In the whole of the LXX, too, apart from a technical use of "*virtues*" to render the "praises" of God, the Greek word occurs only twice as the equivalent of a Hebrew one: but in the highly rhetorical Fourth Book of the Maccabees it occurs seventeen times, and once in the phrase "*the virtue of God*[2]." Similarly this highly rhetorical Pseudo-Peter uses the word thrice, and mentions the "*virtue*" *of God*, as well as that of man.

[**1127**] Substituting "*obtrude*" for "*avoid*", we may say of this writer what Lightfoot says of St Paul: "*Pseudo-Peter* (St Paul) seems studiously to *obtrude* (avoid) this common heathen term for moral excellence." As, in O.T., its frequent use in Maccabees indicates a writer off the lines of Jewish thought, so, in N.T., it points to one who either is, or affects to be, a philosophic or literary Greek. The same tendency is indicated by the use of some phrase with the word "*divine*" in it as a periphrasis for "God". Occurring in the speech of Paul of Tarsus—the Apostle of the Gentiles addressing philosophers on the Areopagus—it is intelligible as an instance of his becoming all things to all men. But in a letter to believers in Christ, it is incredible that the real Peter should have used such phrases as "his *divine* power hath granted unto us," and "that through these ye may become partakers of the *divine* nature[3]."

---

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 9 is not written in the apostle's own person, but is a quotation from Is. xliii. 21.

[2] 4 Macc. x. 10.

[3] [**1127** *a*] Dr Chase (815 *a*) quotes, as a parallel to the above quoted 2 Pet. i. 4, "sharers in the *divine nature*" (from Method. *Conviv. Virg.* ii. 6) "the decree of that same blessed *nature of God*." But the whole context (as given by Dr James, *Apoc. Pet.* p. 95) indicates that the words in question belong to Methodius' comment on the Apocalypse, not to the Apocalypse itself.

§ 6. *Some of his mistakes like those of Baboo English*

[**1128**] A style of this kind has many points of affinity with what is called Baboo English, made familiar in recent years to English readers by Mr Anstey's imitations of it in the pages of *Punch*—imitations that by no means go beyond many original instances. One peculiarity of this literature is that, in straining after novelty of expression, the writer often uses a word (sometimes an archaic word, and generally a rare one) in a context that makes no sense, or obscure sense. For example, "wrangle", in old days, might mean "argue", as we see in the title of "Senior Wrangler": "boot", as late as Shakespeare, meant "profit", "advantage"; but when the Baboo biographer tells us that Mr Mookerjee, as a barrister, "would *wrangle* in a logomachy of words for the *boot* of his client," we feel that, although some would be merely amused, others might be perplexed, and a few actually misled, by such an extraordinary mosaic of words. In this case, the Baboo writer is (theoretically and archaically) correct; but it is easy to see that such a style may often lead the stylist into error when he quotes a proverb or a verse unintelligently, as in Mr Anstey's description of Mr Frankenstein. This begins, correctly (though quaintly), by calling him "so phenomenally addicted to brain-work as to deny himself the most mediocre spree," but goes on to say that "he is pegging away *under a rose* behind the arras," and that "he is of juvenile exterior, *with a countenance sicklied over, like a pale cast*[1]."

[1] [**1128** *a*] That the peculiarities of this style have hardly been exaggerated by Mr Anstey, will appear from the following phrases selected from little more than one page describing the death of Mr Mookerjee (pp. 57–8). "They [the doctors] did what they could do, with their puissance and knack of medical knowledge, but it proved after all as if to milk the ram!...He remained *sotto voce* for a few hours and went to God at about 6 P.M.....His children did *fondre en larmes*...The house presented a second Babel or a pretty kettle of fish."

[**1129**] Blunders of this kind—if they had been possible, which they were not, in a letter really written by the former fisherman of Gennesaret—would almost certainly have been suppressed or corrected in the first century. *But this Epistle was not generally received as genuine till after the fourth century;* and hence some vestiges of error originating from an ambitious and affected style may be still traced in it, not indeed so palpable or amusing as those above described, but still sufficient to convict the author of unintelligent borrowing. Thus for example, whereas Jude speaks of "bringing a *judgment*, i.e. *a suit, or action, for blasphemy*," Pseudo-Peter mistakes this for "*a blasphemous accusation*"[1]; and whereas Jude speaks of "revelling together in your *love-feasts*," ΑΓΑΠΑΙC, Pseudo-Peter probably has "revelling together in their *deceits*," ΑΠΑΤΑΙC[2]. Again, Jude spoke of the fallen angels as being

[1] [**1129** *a*] 2 Pet. ii. 11, *βλάσφημον κρίσιν*, Jude 9, *κρίσιν...βλασφημίας*, R.V. in both, "a railing judgment." But see Field (*Otium*, ad loc.), who quotes fully from Diod. Sic. xvi. 29, xx. 10 and 62, where *ἐπιφέρω δίκην, κρίσεις, εὐθύνας καὶ κρίσεις*="bring an accusation, or lay an information, against anyone." Quoting Diod. Sic. (T. x, p. 171, ed. Bip.) *οἱ καθυβρισθέντες ἐπήνεγκαν κρίσιν τῷ Σατουρνίνῳ περὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς ὕβρεως*, he adds, "The accusation might be described as a *κρίσις ὕβρεως*: here" [*i.e.* in Jude] "it is a *κρίσις βλασφημίας*," and he instances the saying of some that *the devil "charged Moses with being a murderer because he slew the Egyptian.*" He concludes thus: "Instead of bringing St Jude's phraseology into conformity with St Peter's, it would be better to explain *βλάσφημον κρίσιν* in the sense which we have now asserted for *κρίσιν βλασφημίας*." No doubt, it would be correct to render the Greek of Jude as Field does. But it does not follow that it would be correct to render the Greek of Pseudo-Peter in the same way. The latter seems to have mistaken Jude's meaning, and may have altered Jude's words to suit his own mistake. If so, R.V., though incorrect in Jude, has been correct in Pseudo-Peter, faithfully rendering into English the mistake made by the latter in Greek.

[2] [**1129** *b*] "Deceits," so W.H. 2 Pet. ii. 13, in text (but marg. "love-feasts"). See Dr Chase on Jude, Hastings ii. 803 *a*. Did Pseudo-Peter take "deceit," as in Mk iv. 19, to mean *the deceitful pleasure* of this world? Or does his combination of *ἐντρυφᾶν* and *ἀπάταις* combine a misunderstanding of Jude (12) and a pilfering from Hermas *Mand.*

in "*bonds*"; but this florid writer appears first to have preferred a more unusual word meaning "*cords*", and then, by the change of a vowel, to have converted this to a very unusual term meaning excavations to hold corn, pit-falls, and hence *pits*[1]. The Carian inscription uses a fairly common phrase "exhibiting zeal", Pseudo-Peter piles on a second preposition so as to convert this into (at best, as in Demosthenes) "*substituting* zeal", or (at worst, as in the Tebtunis Papyri) "*smuggling* zeal[2]."

§ 7. *His resemblance to the Pseudo-Peter of the Petrine Apocalypse*

[**1130**] Dr Chase quotes from Dr James (*Lect. on Apoc. of Pet.*, p. 52) a remarkable series of coincidences of expression between the Pseudo-Peter of the Apocalypse and the Pseudo-Peter of the Epistle. The former work, the Apocalypse, is, as Dr Chase justly says, "simple and natural in style," as much so indeed as the Epistle is artificial and unnatural. It ought to be regarded as probable, then, that if these coincidences are not accidental, it is the author of the Epistle,

xi. 12 *ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς...καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπάταις* (or some kindred writer)? Comp. ib. *Sim.* vi. 2. 1 *ἄγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης*, 2 *ἀπάταις καὶ τρυφαῖς ματαίαις*, &c. Where Mk iv. 19, Mt. xiii. 22 have "*the deceit* of riches," Lk. viii. 14 has "riches and *pleasures of life*."

[1] [**1129** *c*] "Pits," see Hastings iii. 808 *a*, where Dr Chase quotes Field, *Otium*, ad loc. The hypothesis is that the familiar *δεσμοῖς* was altered to the rare *σειραῖς*, and this to *σειροῖς*.

[2] [**1129** *d*] 2 Pet. i. 5, *παρεισενέγκαντες*. Tebt. Pap. xxxviii. 12, 14, *παρεισφέρω* (bis) "*smuggle*," Carian Inscr. (Böckh ii. p. 483, No. 2715 *a*) *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ἰσφέρεσθαι*: comp. Joseph. xx. 9. 2 *πᾶσαν εἰσηνέγκατο σπουδήν*, Diod. Sic. i. 84 *μεγάλην εἰσφέρονται σπουδήν*, ib. xviii. 34 *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν εἰσεφέροντο*: Wetstein ad loc. quotes also Libanius xxix. p. 670 D *πολλὴν εἰσενέγκασθαι σπουδήν*. It thus appears that Pseudo-Peter *is distorting a familiar straightforward idiom from sense to nonsense* (or, at best, to very pedantical sense—if *παρά* could possibly be taken, in such a word, as "on your part").

not of the Apocalypse, that is the borrower. But, if so, the Epistle-writer has been not only arbitrary but even erroneous in his borrowing. The Apocalypse applies the word "squalid," or "gloomy," *αὐχμηρός*, to *hell*; the Epistle (i. 19) to the "*place*" in which the lamp of Prophecy is glimmering. Again, the former speaks of the "*mire*", *βόρβορος*, of hell, and (subsequently) of the souls "*wallowing*" in it—both of them rare words: the Epistle, having occasion to quote the proverb of "the dog returning to its vomit" (Prov. xxvi. 11, LXX *ἔμετον*), not only improves upon the LXX by substituting for "vomit" a word not alleged to occur elsewhere (*ἐξέραμα*) —just as a Baboo stylist might prefer "returned to his *sickishness*"—but also takes occasion to duplicate the proverb so as to bring in the sonorous *βόρβορος* in the phrase "*wallowing* in the *mire*" ("and the sow that has washed to *wallowing* in the *mire*")[1]. In both these cases the *different* application cannot be called a *mis*-application, for it is only borrowing, not error. But one more instance—if the passages are indeed parallel—will indicate that the writer confused "testing (*δοκιμάζοντας*), or proving, one's soul in this life," a duty enjoined by our Lord, with "*tormenting* (*ἐβασάνιζεν*) his [Lot's] soul with unrighteous works [of others][2]."

§ 8. *His version of the Voice at the Transfiguration*

[**1131**] Owing to this loose way of quoting, or borrowing, we are unable to attach the importance we could wish to the one interesting point in this Epistle—its version of the Voice at the Transfiguration—"'*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*' And this voice we heard....." (1) The

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 22.

[2] [**1130***a*] Both Dr James and Dr Chase print these passages (2 Pet. ii. 8, Apoc. § 1) as parallels. If they are, Pseudo-Peter may have thought that "*this life*" meant "*this world*" as St Paul uses the term, *i.e.* the life of the flesh and of sin.

writer agrees with Matthew, against Mark and Luke—and undoubtedly (**798—801**) against the earliest tradition—in inserting the words "*in whom I am well pleased.*" (2) He disagrees from them all in omitting "*Hear ye him,*" which should follow. (3) He agrees with Matthew in adding "*And the disciples heard it* (*καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταί*)," only that—as Peter is supposed to be speaking—he necessarily substitutes "*we*" for "*the disciples*", so as to give "*and* this voice *we heard.*" If only our Pseudo-Peter had been a trustworthy quoter, he might have been of very great advantage to us at this point. For the text of Matthew suggests that the Evangelist conflated שמעו in its double sense of "*Hear ye*", and "*They heard*"[1]: and we might suppose that Pseudo-Peter *had a text that contained only the latter.* Even as it is, his evidence, as pointing in that direction, is worth something. But it is not worth much.

§ 9. *His reiterations*

[**1132**] Besides giving other specimens of solecism, for which space cannot be found here, Dr Chase also calls attention to many instances of unpleasing, tedious reiteration. St Paul and St John repeat words, and even play upon them, but always with a meaning and a purpose. The Pseudo-Petrine trick of repetition is quite different. It suggests that the writer, having got hold of a word or phrase that takes his fancy (sometimes one not elsewhere used in N.T.), cannot

[1] [**1131** *a*] Comp. Gen. xxiii. 15, "*Hearken* (imperat.)," LXX "*I have heard*"; Lam. i. 21 "*They have heard,*" LXX "*Hear ye indeed.*"

[**1131** *b*] The contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the "Second Epistle of St Peter" comes out nowhere more clearly than in their several treatments of the Voice from Heaven. The former neither supports nor contradicts any Synoptist, but gives a highly spiritual account probably based on some old tradition; *the latter supports the least accurate of the three accounts* (*Matthew's*) *and apparently adds a negative inaccuracy of his own.*

let it alone till he has used it again, as, for example, in the twice-repeated phrase "*stir up by putting in remembrance*," and the twofold repetition of the word "*be-feverous*"—used in Greek literature, so far as we know, only by two medical writers[1], to mean "*suffer from a remittent fever*," but applied by Pseudo-Peter to the destruction of the world by fire. Shakespeare, in his four mentions of the word "feverous," applies the word twice to the "earth" or "world"; and it is possible that an Asiatic, who may have caught up some Sibylline verses about earthquakes—a frequent topic with the Sibyl—may have extracted the word from that source. And, in florid Asiatic Greek, a single mention of the word in the Shakespearian sense might be pardonable. But if that is the meaning, this writer rides it to death, loading the sentence with other repetitions as well, thus: "But the *elements being-in-a-fever-fit shall be dissolved* ..... These things then *being* thus *to be dissolved*, what manner of persons ought ye to be...hastening the day of the Lord by reason of which the heavens being on fire *shall be dissolved* and *the elements being-in-a-fever-fit* shall waste away[2]." In all this fine language, where is there a trace of the single-hearted apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, or of the simple nobility of such words as these (1 Pet. iv. 7): "*But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore of sound mind, and be sober unto prayer: above all things being fervent in your love among yourselves; for love covereth a multitude of sins*"?

§ 10. *His mention of "all the Epistles" of "our beloved brother Paul"*

[**1133**] Toward the close of the Epistle, the writer implies that his readers had previously received a letter, or letters,

[1] See Hastings iii. 807. "The word does not appear to occur elsewhere," *i.e.* except in Dioscorides and Galen.

[2] 2 Pet. iii. 10—12.

from the Apostle Paul: "Even as also our beloved brother Paul...hath written unto you, as also in *all* [*his*] *epistles*... in which are some things hard to understand, which the unlearned and unsteadfast wrest, as they also do *the rest of the Scriptures*, to their own perdition." It is difficult not to agree with Dr Chase (1) that the writer of these words had before him a collection of "*all* the Epistles" of St Paul, and (2) that they had by that time attained to the rank of "Scriptures"—both of which conclusions are incompatible with Petrine authorship and scarcely compatible with authorship of any date earlier than the second century.

[**1134**] The argument against the Second Epistle, derivable from its contrast to the First, need not be insisted on—and this, for two reasons. In the first place, the contrast must be obvious to all readers, even from the English text; in the second, the two most prominent advocates of the genuineness of the Second Epistle are, so Dr Chase tells us, "obliged to give up the real Petrine authorship" of the First[1].

§ 11. *Not an "imitator" of Josephus, but perhaps a pilferer from him*

[**1135**] Many years ago, in some articles in the *Expositor* (2nd Series, vol. iii. p. 49 ff.), when illustrating the style of the Second Epistle by quotations from Baboo English, I maintained that the author "*imitated*" Josephus. In the face of the new testimony to indiscriminate borrowing brought forward by Dr James, Dr Chase, and Professor Deissmann, I am disposed to think this was an error. One would not speak of the jackdaw in the fable, arrayed in feathers borrowed from a number of different birds, as "*imitating*" any one of them. "*Imitation*" implies some kind of artistic unity. At all events it implies some concentrated effort, as in the fable about the ass personating the lion, which presupposes that the lion's

[1] Hastings iii. 813 *b*.

skin has been stolen whole. In this Epistle there is no such art, and absolutely no concentration. Though adhering, then, to everything that I formerly asserted about the mongrel style, and vacuity of thought, in this blemish on our Canonical Scriptures, I nevertheless desire to retract the word "*imitated*" and to substitute "*pilfered*". Nor would I now venture to say with confidence "pilfered from *Josephus*", but rather, "pilfered certainly from Jude, almost certainly from the Petrine Apocalypse, not improbably from some heathen form of religious decree like the Carian Inscription above quoted, from some iambic poem, from Sibylline hexameters, from Philo[1], from Josephus[2]—and from other sources so numerous that, if they could all be ascertained and the pilferings removed from the Epistle, nothing at all would be left of the author's own except the true statement that he knew of '*all*' St Paul's Epistles, and the false statement that he heard the Voice at the Transfiguration."

---

[1] [**1135** *a*] Philo. See Hastings iii. p. 816, where Dr Chase gives as instances ἰσότιμος, ἀρετή (applied to God), ἡ φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ θεία φύσις, and λογικῆς κεκοινωνήκασι φύσεως. But all these might perhaps be derived from Josephus (see next note). More convincing is Philo i. 510, "the prophet utters nothing *as* [*his*] *private* [*utterance*] (ἴδιον)" as compared with 2 Pet. i. 20, "*of private interpretation*". This last passage suggests that Pseudo-Peter misunderstood Philo.

---

[2] [**1135** *b*] "Not improbably.....from Josephus." The Epistle begins by saying that (1) all things are bestowed on us by "the divine power" through the recognition of Him that called us through His "*virtue*" that we may "become *sharers of the divine nature*." (2) The middle (and greater) portion of it deals with the *punishing* (κολαζομένους) of those who will not thus recognize God. (3) Much of the third and last section deals with the *physical nature of the*

world (the earth being made out of "water" and destined to perish by "fire"). But these three thoughts are not connected in the Epistle.

[**1135** *c*] Josephus, in the Preface to his *Antiquities*, has the same three thoughts, in reverse order, and gives them a logical connection. People ask, he says (Pref. § 4), why the Law deals so largely with "*physiology*" (*i.e.* the science of *nature*, inanimate, animate, and divine). To this he replies that Moses made it his first object to "understand the *nature of God*" and to become a spectator of His works. Without this, all that may be enacted "with a view to *virtue*" will be fruitless unless people understand that following God brings blessedness, and departing from Him brings calamity. Moses taught men to behold God and the structure of the world, and to perceive that men are "the fairest of God's works upon earth." When Moses had thus led men to "reverence [of God] (εὐσέβειαν)," the rest followed. Other lawgivers begin from human contracts and human rights; some even slander God with shameful and vicious myths, imputing to Him the sins of men: "But our lawgiver, exhibiting God with His *virtue* intact, resolved that men should attempt to *participate in it*"; and those who refused he "punished (ἐκόλασε)."

[**1135** *d*] Here, in one short section of Josephus' Preface, we find, if not the very Pseudo-Petrine phrases, at all events the Pseudo-Petrine notions in very similar phrases, about "*God's virtue*", "*divine nature*" and our "*sharing* in it", the "*punishment*" for refusal, and a reference to the physical structure of the world. But in the Preface they follow an orderly and intelligible arrangement; in the Epistle they appear to follow no logical arrangement at all. This is just what might be expected from an unintelligent pilferer, who sets words above thoughts and sonorousness above sense. While withdrawing (for the above-mentioned reasons) the statement that Pseudo-Peter "imitated" this section, I am

still of the opinion that he attempted to pilfer thoughts from it, and that he succeeded in pilfering phrases[1].

[1] [1135 *e*] Since the circulation of this Appendix in the form of a pamphlet called *Contrast* (Feb. 1903) I have been favoured with criticisms that appear to indicate a confusion arising partly from the technical term "pseudepigraphy"—as though all "pseudepigraphers" were on one level of morality—and partly from a failure to distinguish between an ungrammatical style, or even a bad style, and a *base* style. One critic says, "Is there anything more immoral in mongrel Greek than in the mongrel English described above (1128)?" There is not, in the abstract. But does not something depend on the nature of the subject? If a man garnishes his description of the death of a near relation with such terms as "*fondre en larmes*", "*sotto voce*", "*second Babel*", "*pretty kettle of fish*"—how different this from the simple straightforward style of "Govinda Samunda", "The Lake of Palms," and other works of our Indian fellow-subjects!—does it not convict the writer of an egotistical treason against good feeling almost constituting an offence against morality? And when the subject mounts still higher, to a description of the Transfiguration as recorded by an eye-witness, an Apostle of our Lord, is not the sin of "the purple patch" proportionately increased? It seems to me that a pseudepigrapher sinning after this fashion deserves to be distinguished by a special name. One Pseudo-Peter wrote a *Gospel of Peter*. Another wrote an *Apocalypse of Peter*. Both wrote fictions. Probably, too, both were heretics. But each was absorbed in his subject and wrote in his own natural way. So I call both of these simply "pseudepigraphers". The third wrote the "*Second Epistle of St Peter*." Probably, he was orthodox. Not improbably, he had some motives that seemed to him good. But he appears to me convicted on irresistible evidence, not only of writing fiction but also of posing as a fine writer. Hence, to distinguish him briefly from his namesakes, I called him a "forger". But I meant by this—and should be willing to substitute for it, if space allowed, in each case—"a pseudepigrapher of the baser sort."

APPENDIX VI

THE PROMISE OF EUSEBIUS[1]

[**1136**] In the opening sentences of Eusebius' History, the Writings, *i.e.* Scriptures (*γραφαί*)[2] of the New Testament, receive no mention. Writings, in his mind, are at this stage subordinate to persons. His first five words indicate the historian's principal thought, "*The successions of* (i.e. *to*) *the Holy Apostles.*" This key-word, "succession", may be illustrated by the two key-words in the first sentence of the *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*: "Moses *received* the Torah from Sinai, and he *delivered* it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets *delivered* it to the men of the Great Synagogue." The question, with both writers, is, not (primarily) what was *true*, but what was "delivered" and "received" in due "succession". If the "succession" was observed, then—both Eusebius and the author of the *Aboth* would say—the doctrine must be true. "It came from Sinai," says the Jewish writer; "from

[1] [**1136** *a*] There have been recent (Apr. 1903) indications of a failure to understand or appreciate Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation (*Essays on Supernat. Rel.* pp. 36—40) of the Promise of Eusebius—in which the historian pledges himself to record what has been said by previous ecclesiastical writers about the Canonical and acknowledged Writings, or Scriptures (*γραφαί*) of the New Testament. This Appendix will restate his interpretation and add some confirmatory details.

[2] Lightfoot sometimes calls them Scriptures, sometimes Writings. In this Appendix it will be convenient to use the latter term invariably, even when in other respects adhering to Lightfoot's rendering of Eusebius.

Christ", says the Christian. But both say in effect, "The truth is proved by *succession*."

[1137] Hence, as long as Eusebius is dealing with the period of apostolic *action*—while the Apostles were still preaching the Gospel and founding the Churches—the Apostolic *Writings* receive very little notice from him. But as soon as he relates an Apostle's death, the historian's thoughts naturally turn to the Epistles through which he continued to speak to the Church. This was all the more natural because, in Greek, *Apostle* and *Epistle* are closely related. Both imply "sending". "*Apostle*" is a person "*sent off* with a message"; "*Epistle*" is something "*sent on* in addition," either in writing or by word of mouth. In the Greek Tragedians, "*Epistle*" means for the most part an authoritative message, or command; and the word is occasionally used of the last injunctions or commands of a dying person, sometimes written but sometimes unwritten[1]. Thus James is described, first as the brother of the Lord, and then as the first Bishop of Jerusalem[2]; but no mention is made of any writings of his till after the account of his martyrdom[3], when we are told that the first of the so-called Catholic Epistles is assigned to him, but that this Epistle, like that of Jude, is called spurious, though both are read publicly in very many (or, most) (πλείσταις) churches[4].

[1138] Similarly, as to Peter. The Apostle's *actions* are related in the Second Book at considerable length; but no mention is made in it of his *writings* except incidentally, to say that, in his First Epistle, Peter mentioned Mark, whose Gospel he approved[5]. Paul, too, in the Second Book, is described as preaching and founding Churches in Corinth and

[1] [1137 *a*] See Hesych. *ἐπιστολαί*: *ἐντολαὶ*, *ἐπιταγαί* &c. with Alberti's note. Hemst. on Lucian *Dial.* x. 2 (i. p. 231) quotes Lysidis *Epistolam ἐπιστολὰν ἀπέστειλεν* (leg. *ἐπέστειλεν* as in txt of Luc.) "quod paulo ante *ἐπισκάπτειν ἐπίσκαψιν*."

[2] i. 12. 5, ii. 1. 3 foll.

[3] ii. 23. 1—24.

[4] ii. 23. 24–5.

[5] ii. 15. 2.

Rome; but practically nothing is said in it about his Epistles[1]. The Third Book passes from the Apostles to their successors, and now the aspect of things is changed. Along with the *personal* "successions of the Apostles" (*i.e.* the Bishops), lists of which he had promised to give, Eusebius perceives that he must now begin to deal with the Writings that they, *i.e.* the Apostles, or their amanuenses or pupils, have left behind them to represent their doctrine.

[1139] Hence, after recapitulating (iii. 1. 1) the *actions* of "the holy Apostles"[2] (Thomas, Andrew, John, Peter, and Paul) in spreading the Gospel throughout the world, and after mentioning their first successor in Rome (namely (iii. 2. 1) Linus, whose name occurs in Paul's Epistle to Timothy) he approaches the subject of their *writings*. Now Thomas and Andrew left nothing in writing; John was still alive, but had not yet written anything. Consequently, of the five Apostles, above mentioned as evangelizing the world, two alone remained, Peter and Paul, whose writings claimed the historian's attention *at this point*. But still he regards the Epistles of *all* the Apostles as his real subject, although (for convenience) he limits his detailed remarks, for the present, to the Epistles of only two of them. And further, while calling special attention to the disputed character of the so-called Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews (at-

[1] These negative statements are based upon the Indices of Schwegler and Heinichen as well as on my own recollection of the text: ii. 17. 12 refers to some theory of the Historian that Philo, in some remarks about the Therapeutae, may have had in view such expositions as may be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and several other Epistles of Paul.

[2] iii. 1. 1—3 ends with a statement that the writer is quoting from a work of Origen's; but we are without means for ascertaining (as the work is lost) where the quotation begins. The uncertainty, however, does not affect the argument, namely, that Eusebius when he speaks of "the holy Apostles", in iii. 1. 1, means *the Apostles generally*, not Peter and Paul alone; and that "the Apostles", in the titles of iii. 2 and iii. 3, ought to be taken in the same inclusive sense.

tributed by some to Paul) he takes the opportunity now—which he did not take when he mentioned the Epistle of James, because he was then in the period of apostolic *action*, not in the period of *their successors and their Epistles*—to enter into the whole question of the Writings that were, and of the Writings that were not, to be included in the New Testament, indicating a test by which he will help his readers to discriminate between Canonical and Uncanonical Writings, as his history proceeds. And he concludes his section by an apparent reference to his test as being suggested for the "demonstration"[1] of canonicity or non-canonicity.

[**1140**] What is this test? It is, in the first place, the evidence of a succession of Christian writers, who either made *quotations from* a "disputed" document (in a manner suggesting that they recognized it as authoritative and apostolic) or else handed down *traditions about* its apostolic or its non-apostolic character. And here a superficial reading might suggest that Eusebius would stop. Why should he trouble himself about the "undisputed" documents? To give the patristic *quotations from* them would be endless and useless. And why should he give *traditions about* them?

[**1141**] Perhaps Eusebius would have replied, "Because the Gospels of Mark and Luke, though undisputed, were not

[1] [**1139** *a*] iii. 3. 7 "Let this suffice (εἰρήσθω) *for a demonstration* (εἰς παράστασιν) of those Divine Writings (θείων γραμμάτων) which are unquestionable and of those which are not acknowledged among all." Lightfoot renders παράστασις "statement". But Heinichen gives "expositio", "demonstratio", as the meaning both here, and in i. 3. 10, i. 6. 11, vi. 19. 11, and *De Mart. Pal.* x. 1, where that sense seems in each case suitable or necessary. In i. 6. 11, ταῦτα δ' ἡμῖν ἀναγκαίως εἰς παράστασιν τῆς τῶν χρόνων ἀληθείας (?) προτετηρήσθω it occurs with εἰς, and in Epictet. ii. 19. 1 with πρός (where Schweig. in Index and Transl. has "probatio", "demonstratio", "ad probandum"). In the spurious *Quaest. et Respons. ad Orthodox.* § 68 εἰς παράστασιν τῆς τοῦ ζητουμένου ἀληθείας is rendered (rightly it seems) "ad quaestionis veritatem astruendam." This rendering makes no difference to Lightfoot's argument, which is rather strengthened than weakened by it.

written by Apostles, and I wish to give early *traditions about them* to shew that they were *severally written under the sanction of the Apostles Peter and Paul.*" He might also have desired to explain why the Fourth Gospel was so very late, and so very different from the Three. Lastly, he might feel that it was expedient to meet the following not unnatural objection: "If the earliest, or any single Gospel, was inspired, why were later or other Gospels written covering the same ground?" But from these considerations, which merely indicate the antecedent probability that Eusebius *would* give *traditions about* "undisputed" Writings, we must pass to his text, which will prove that he *did actually* not only promise to do this, but afterwards refer to his promise, and faithfully fulfil it.

[**1142**] This, then, is the text of the Promise, very literally translated:—

(iii. 3. 3) "But, as the history proceeds, I will take care[1], along with the successions[2], to indicate[3] what [individuals] of the Church writers, [who flourished] from time to time, have made use of disputed Writings[4] [and] what [Writings they were]; and [to indicate] (lit.) *what things* (*τίνα*) *have been said by them about the Canonical and acknowledged Writings* (*γραφῶν*), and as many things as [have been said by them]

[1] [**1142** *a*] "Take care", so Lightf., *προῦργου ποιήσομαι.* But it might mean "I shall make it my business," "consider it to the point" &c. (Heinichen, "id agere ut", "sich es angelegen sein lassen," "sich es zum Geschäft machen," and see L.S.): that is, "Although I mentioned merely *successions* at the opening of my History, yet I shall consider *Writings* also a part of my work."

[2] [**1142** *b*] "Successions", *i.e.* first, the successions, or successors, to the Apostles, which he promised (i. 1. 1) to give, and then the successors to those successors, and so on (**1136**).

[3] [**1142** *c*] "Indicate", *ὑποσημήνασθαι.* Not here "suggest", which would make nonsense, but "record *by the way*, or, *as I go on*, as an integral, though subordinate, part of my work."

[4] "Writings", *i.e.* *γραφῶν*, implied by fem. *ὁποίαις.*

about those that are not such [*i.e.* not acknowledged as Canonical][1]." So much for the Promise.

[**1143**] Later on, after an interesting anecdote about the aged Apostle, John, Eusebius proceeds to discuss his "Writings", including his Gospel and his Apocalypse as well as his Epistles: and here he states the causes that (according to "report") induced, first Matthew, and last John, to commit their Gospels to writing. Then after a brief reference to Mark's Gospel as having been previously stated to be (ii. 15) written with Peter's sanction, and Luke's as being written by a follower of Paul and the other Apostles, he makes what appears to be a repetition of the Promise thus:

(iii. 24. 16) "Thus much we ourselves [have to say] about these [*i.e.* the Four Gospels]. But (?) at such season as may be more suitable[2], we shall endeavour, by quoting the ancient writers, to set forth *the things said* also by the others about them," *i.e.* said about the Four Gospels by the other ecclesiastical Writers or Fathers who preceded Eusebius.

In view of recent erroneous interpretation, the reader will do well to note that, if the second passage is a repetition of the first, then the phrase in the Promise, "*what things* (*τίνα*) *have been said*" corresponds, in the repetition of the Promise,

---

[1] See **1145** foll. for the Gk and the details of its interpretation.

[2] [**1143** *a*] Οἰκειότερον, Lightfoot (*S. R.* p. 39) "more particularly". According to this rendering, the meaning of Eusebius would be that—whereas in the traditions he has hitherto given about the Four Gospels, he has quoted no *persons*, only "*report*", λόγος, *generally*—in his future remarks he proposes to quote *persons particularly*, e.g. Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, in order.

In adopting this rendering, Lightfoot was probably influenced by the order of the words, οἰκειότερον κατὰ καιρόν. But might not this have been intended to emphasize the adjective? Moreover, Lightfoot himself (*ib.*) renders iii. 24. 18 ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ "at a *proper* season." And Valesius (followed apparently by Heinichen) renders οἰκεῖος similarly here, and, I think, rightly. The "more suitable" season for quoting Irenaeus, for example, will be when the History comes to the period of Irenaeus.

to "*the things said*", τὰ εἰρημένα, so that the meaning in both is "*all that has been said.*"

[**1144**] When Eusebius comes to the times of Irenaeus, the "season" has arrived for fulfilling his Promise by quoting *traditions about* the Canonical Scriptures from this author, and he not only does this but expressly says that he does it in fulfilment of his Promise:

(v. 8. 1) "But since at the commencement of our treatise we have made a promise, saying that we should quote the *utterances of the ancient Elders and Writers of the Church* [each] in [its] season, whereby they have handed down in writing the traditions that have come down to them *about the Canonical Writings*, and [since] of these [Writers] Irenaeus was one, let us quote his words also, and first those relating to *the sacred Gospels*, as follows."

By "*also*", he means, in effect, this: "I quoted 'in their season' the words of Papias (iii. 39. 15—16) about Mark's and Matthew's Gospels, and a brief statement of Justin (iv. 18. 8) about John's Apocalypse: now I will quote those of Irenaeus *also* about the Canonical Scriptures and first about the Gospels." Thus, both by a definite reference to his general "Promise", and also by his actual practice in these three particular cases, Eusebius demonstrates the nature of the original Promise so clearly that, even if it had been lost, we should know that the historian had pledged himself to quote from Hegesippus, Justin, Papias, Irenaeus and subsequent writers in their order, *whatever each had said about the Canonical Scriptures.*

[**1145**] In opposition, however, to this conclusion, it has been recently[1] maintained concerning the above-quoted (**1142**) Promise of Eusebius[2], (1) that τινα cannot mean "*what*

[1] *The Contemporary Review*, Apr. 1903.

[2] iii. 3. 3 Προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας προὔργου ποιήσομαι, σὺν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ὑποσημήνασθαι, τίνες τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγ-

things", but must mean "*certain things*", because "*what*" would be expressed by the singular τί, (2) that γραφῶν means "epistles", (3) that the context and the title of the section shew the "epistles" to mean merely those of Paul and Peter. The conclusion proposed by the objector is, that Eusebius merely promised to tell us "*certain things*" said by ancient writers concerning the Canonical "*Epistles of Peter and of Paul*" and concerning those that are not such.

[**1146**] Against this view there is, in the first place, the objection that Eusebius, as a fact, tells us *practically nothing about* the Canonical Epistles of Peter and Paul—nothing at all events comparable in extent and importance with what he tells us (in quotations from Papias and others) about the Gospels. In the next place, to deal with the three objections mentioned above:—

(1) τινα (*a*) *can* mean "what things[1]", and (*b*) *would naturally have* that meaning here[2].

γραφέων ὁποίαις κέχρηνται τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, **τίνα** τε περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων **γραφῶν**, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων αὐτοῖς εἴρηται.

[1] [**1146** *a*] See Euseb. vi. 24 (title) "*What-things* (τίνα) he (Origen) taught at (ἐπὶ) Alexandria," *ib.* vi. 32 (title) "*What-things* (τίνα) Origen taught in Caesarea," Euseb. *Praeparatio Evang.* i. 2 (title) "*What-things* (τίνα) it is customary to say against us," Job xxiii. 5 "Would that I might perceive *what-things* (τίνα) he will report to me!" In Euseb. iii. 9. 5, Schwegler and Heinichen read τίνα, "*which* [of them]".

[2] [**1146** *b*] The interrogative meaning is favoured by the parallelism of the previous τίνες, "*what* persons", which naturally leads the reader to take the following τίνα as "*what* things". Moreover, if Eusebius had meant "*certain* things", he might have expressed this briefly and unambiguously by τινα τῶν εἰρημένων.

[**1146** *c*] It may be urged, however, that Eusebius, if he used an interrogative τίνα parallel to a previous interrogative τίνες, ought to have consistently repeated τίνα interrogatively in the third parallel clause, whereas he passes into ὅσα. But this variation is characteristic of late Greek; and somewhat similar variations are found (1) in the very first sentence of his history, (2) in the titles of his works as compared with each other, and (3) in an extract that he quotes from Papias. Similar variations appear in Josephus and Diodorus Siculus.

Comp. (*a*) Euseb. i. 1. 1—2 Τὰς...διαδοχὰς...ὅσα τε καὶ πηλίκα...καὶ

(2) *γραφῶν* could not mean "epistles" except in very special circumstances, which do not exist here[1].

ὅσοι...ὅσοι τε...τίνες τε καὶ ὅσοι...καὶ τὰ...περιελθόντα, ὅσα τε αὖ καὶ ὁποῖα... καὶ πηλίκοι (where **τίνες τε καὶ ὅσοι** is superfluously long and the whole sentence shews a desire of variation), (*b*) Euseb. (quoting Papias) iii. 39. 4 *τί* 'A. *ἢ τί* Π. *εἶπεν, ἢ τί* Φ. *ἢ τί* Θ. *ἢ* 'I. *ἢ τί* 'I. *ἢ* M. *ἢ...ἅ τε* 'A. *καὶ ὁ π.* 'I... *λέγουσιν*, (*c*) (direct) Joseph. *Ant.* xvi. 2. 4 (Niese 51) **ποία** *μὲν εὔνοια πρὸς τὸν ὑμέτερον οἶκον παραλέλειπται;* **ποία** *δὲ πίστις ἐνδεὴς ἐστιν;* **τίς** *δὲ οὐ νενόηται τιμή;* (quoted by Jan. 589 n., Jos. *Ant.* xvi. 2. 21 *ποία μὲν εὔνοια πρὸς τὸν ὑμέτερον οἶκον παραλείπεται; ποία δὲ πίστις ἐνδεὴς ἐστιν; τίς δ' οὐ τετίμηται τιμή;* Neither Niese nor Hudson mentions such variations as *παραλείπεται* and *τετίμηται*. Jan. quotes, immediately before this, Diod. 12, p. 128 *οἱ τοὺς Θουρίους οἰκοῦντες ἐστασίαζον πρὸς ἀλλήλους* **ποίας** *πόλεως ἀποίκους καλεῖσθαι τοὺς Θουρίους καὶ* **τίνα** *κτίστην δίκαιον ὀνομάζεσθαι;* but in Diod. xii. 35 Heyne (vol. v. p. 72) inserts *δεῖ* before *καλεῖσθαι* and mentions no v.r.).

[**1146** *d*] Comp. also the titles of Euseb. vi. 24 and 32, "*What-things* (*τίνα*) he taught," with that of vi. 36 "*how-many* other-things (*ὅσα ἄλλα*)," all of which relate to the teaching and writing of Origen. Lastly, 1 Tim. i. 7, "not understanding either (lit.) *the things that* (*ἅ*) they say or about *what-things* (*τίνων*) they asseverate," illustrates not only the habit of variation but also the neut. plural use of *τίς*.

[**1146** *e*] Mr F. C. Burkitt, who informs me that the Syriac version of Euseb. iii. 3. 3 gives no countenance to the opinion that *τινα*="some things", has been kind enough to send me the following literal translation of the Syriac: "While we proceed with the history, we will make known, together with the succession [of the Bishops], which of the writers of the Church, in their times, out of the books about which there is a doubtful verdict—how they used them, and *as to how it was said by them about the Holy Books* which the Church acknowledges without doubt, and about those [books] which are not so." It will also be perceived that the Syriac discountenances the view that *γραφῶν* means "Epistles".

[1] [**1146** *f*] This note will deal with the passages alleged to shew that "Eusebius *very often* uses the terms *ἐπιστολὴ* and *γραφὴ* interchangeably." Some of them, ii. 22. 2—5, iv. 14. 8—9 (not alleged but perhaps intended under an erroneous reference to iv. 14. 2 (*διήγησις*, not *γραφή*)), iv. 15. 46 (perh. intended under an erroneous reference "*ib.* 15 and 46"), vii. 22. 1—11, merely shew that when Eusebius has previously spoken of an Epistle, he subsequently refers to it as "the *same*, or *above mentioned*, writing," *i.e.* document, or says "he *again* communicates in *writing*, or sends a *writing*" &c. It may be added that in iv. 15. 1 and iv. 15. 15 *ἡ γραφή* refers to a previous mention of a martyrdom "extant *in writing* (*ἐγγράφως*)". In *Vit. Const.* ii. 23. 1, describing how Constantine sent

(3) The context and the title have been shewn above (**1139**) to refer to *all* the Apostles and not to two of them alone.

To this it may be added that the Greek phrase "Canonical Writings, or Writing" occurs in the History (according to Heinichen's Index) four times excluding the passage in question: and in all these it means Canonical Scriptures as a whole, never Canonical Epistles[1].

[1147] Our conclusion is twofold, positive and negative. (1) (*Positive*). Eusebius intended to relate all that was said by Papias, Justin, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, &c. about all the

---

out through the empire a proclamation ἐν γραφῇ, the phrase should not be rendered "in an epistle", but "in writing". (See context.)

[**1146** *g*] The only passage that repays detailed consideration is Euseb. ii. 17. 12 "the Gospels and *the writings* of the Apostles, and...." Eusebius is here commenting on an expression of Philo's concerning the sacred books used by certain ascetics in Egypt, commonly called Therapeutae, whom Eusebius takes to be Christians. Philo calls the books "treatises (συγγράμματα) of men of old (παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν) who, having been leaders of their sect, left behind many memorials of their method (?) (ἰδέας) in dealing with allegorical matter (ἐν τοῖς ἀλληγορουμένοις)." These "treatises", Eusebius thinks, may include "the Gospels" (two of which, though not written by Apostles, were written under the influence of Apostles, *i.e.* "leaders" of the "sect") and the "writings of the Apostles" generally. There is no reason to think that "writings" here means "epistles". If it did, it would exclude the Apocalypse of John the Apostle, which, although a disputed book, would hardly be excluded by Eusebius in a passage dealing with allegorical treatment of prophecy in Christian writings.

[**1146** *h*] In none of these passages, except the last, is γραφή used in the plural, and in none of them is there the slightest danger of ambiguity. In the only place where the plural is used, the separate mention of "Gospels" ("*Gospels* and *Writings* of the Apostles") makes it clear that the term Writings of the Apostles does not mean "all the Scriptures". The examples, then, taken as a whole, tend to shew that Eusebius would never use γραφαί to mean "letters", where there was any chance of its being confused with the regular meaning of γραφαί, namely "Scriptures".

[1] The four passages given by Heinichen's Index (beside the present) are iii. 9. 5 (O.T., and the context adds "of the Old Testament"), v. 8. 1 (N.T.), vi. 14. 1 (N.T.), vi. 25 (title) (O.T. and N.T.).

Canonical Scriptures, and he has accordingly related every saying of importance found at this day in the extant works of Justin and Irenaeus about the Canonical Scriptures. Hence we infer that he has been equally faithful in the case of Papias and Hegesippus (whose works are lost except for a few fragments). (2) (*Negative*). Hegesippus, the author of a History in five books, now lost, is freely quoted by Eusebius, who tells us that the five books had come down to his time and that the historian (iv. 22. 1) says certain things about the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. But Eusebius does *not* tell us that he said anything about the Canonical Writings. We consequently infer that Hegesippus said nothing about them.

Again, Papias—who, like Hegesippus, wrote five books—is recorded by Eusebius as saying certain things about the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, but not as saying anything about those of Luke and John. We consequently infer that Papias said nothing about Luke and John.

[**1148**] It is quite another matter to decide *why* Hegesippus was totally, and Papias partially silent. So, too, it would be quite another matter to decide why Justin—who avoids the name "Gospel" and prefers "The Memoirs of the Apostles[1]"—says nothing in his extant works about any of the Four Gospels, and nothing about the Epistles. His only saying of this kind is one about the Apocalypse. Each writer may have had his own reasons for silence. Hegesippus may have preferred to describe martyrdoms and the successions of the Apostles. Justin—a most rhetorical and inaccurate writer—may have been so absorbed in controverting Jews and correcting the misapprehensions of Gentiles that he did not trouble himself to draw any careful distinction between *Memoirs of the Apostolic traditions concerning the Lord written by the followers of the Apostles*, and *Memoirs concerning the Lord written by the Apostles themselves*, nor to specify their authors by name.

[1] *Enc. Bib.* 1819

[**1149**] Papias, on the other hand, expressly says that he took a great deal of pains to go back as near as possible to the actual words of the Lord through the words of His Apostles Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew[1]. Subsequently, Papias tells us certain things about the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, but nothing about those of Luke and John[2]. Under these circumstances it appears reasonable to infer that at the time, and in the place, in which this historian wrote, the Third and Fourth Gospels were not as yet recognized as authoritative, or at all events that they were not recognized as such by the enquiring mind of Papias. There are other facts—as to which I must refer my readers to the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*[3]—which make this conclusion not only reasonable but also extremely probable.

[1] iii. 39. 4.
[2] iii. 39. 15—16.
[3] *Enc. Bib.* "Gospels", col. 1813.

INDICES

I. Index of New Testament Passages

II. Index of Subject-matter (English and Greek)

III. Index of Subject-matter (Hebrew)

I

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

[*The references are to paragraphs, indicated by black numbers*]

MATTHEW

		PAR.
3	3	**830** *a*
	11	**856** *a*
	13	**553–724**, esp. **610–6**
	13–16	**597–609**
	14	**581** *c*, *d*, **588** *a*, **606–9**
	15	**575** *a*, **609** *a*, **1062**, **1066**
	16	**617–52**; **662–84**
	16–17	**553–724**
	17	**786–816**; **850–864**
4	11	**609** *a*
5	16	**969**, **1022**
6	9–10	**965–71** (viii)
	13	**940** *d*, **970**, **971** (i)
	14	**1021** *b*
10	4	**928** *a*
	29	**748** *a*
	37–8	**928** (i) *a* foll.
11	9–10	**830–1**
	10	**839**
	14	**1062**
	25	**923** *a*, *b*, **984**, **1003** *a*, **1014**
	29	**928** (iii)
12	18	**672** *b*, **787**, **802–11**, **813** *a*
13	11	**660**
	16	**660**
14	23	**630** *a*
16	4	**931** *b*
	14	**841**, **873–4**
	16	**789–90**
	17	**719**, **849** *a*
	18	**891** *a*
	22	**979** *d*

MATTHEW

		PAR.
16	23	**891** *a*, *b*
	24	**928** (i) *a* foll.
	28	**646** *a*, **660**
17	1	**630** *a*
	2	**864** *b*, comp. **880–1**
	2–4	**876**
	4	**865** foll., **891–5**
	5	**786** foll., **–907**
	6	**885** *a*
19	29	**928** (iv)
20	21	**1021** *b*
	22–3	**978** *b*
	28	**925**
22	37	**928** (ii)
23	13	**944** *a*
	34	**831** *a*
25	31	**838** *a*
26	24	**983** *a*, **985**
	29	**934–6**
	36	**942** foll.
	38	**917–24**, **942** foll., **1003** *a*
	39	**929–31** *i* foll., **975–6**, **1010** *c*
	40	**941** *b*
	41	**941** *a*, **960** *e*
	41–47	**941** foll.
	42	**932**, **955–6**
	44	**932**
	53	**979**
27	40	**788**
	42	**788**
	45–50	**1052–69**
	46	**1066**
	49	**1066**, **1069**
	50	**1066**
	54	**790** *a*

MARK

		PAR.
1	1	**851**
	1–3	**830–5**, **839** *a*
	2	**837** *b*, **839** *a*
	4	**851**
	9	**597–605**; **610–6**
	9–11	**553–724**
	10	**617–52**; **662–84**
	11	**786–816**; **850–864**
2	24	**939** *a*
3	13	**630** *a*
	19	**928** *a*
4	11	**660**
5	12	**680** *a*
	13	**680** *a*
6	3	**558** *b*
	15	**872–4**
	46	**630** *a*
8	12	**931** *b*
	28	**841**, **873–4**
	29	**789–90**
	33	**891** *a*, *b*
	34	**928** (i) *a* foll.
9	1	**646** *a*, **660**
	2	**630** *a*, **864** *b*, **875**
	3	**864** *b*, **901** *b*, **907** *a*
	4	**875** foll.
	5	**865** foll., **875**, **885** foll.
	6	**885** foll.
	7	**786–849**
10	30	**928** (iv)
	37	**1021** *b*
	38	**978** *b*
	45	**925**
12	15	**933** *h*

MARK

		PAR.
12	30	**928** (ii)
14	20	**978** *b*
	21	**983** *a*, **985**
	25	**934–6**
	32	**942** foll.
	33	**941** *b*
	34	**917** foll., **942** foll.
	35	**955–6**
	35–6	**929–31, 952–6** foll., **1003** *b*
	36	**931** *d–i*, **975–9**; **1010**
	37, 38	**960** *c*, *e*
	38–43	**941–56** foll.
	39	**932, 946** *a*, **949** foll.
15	32	**788**
	33–7	**1052–69**
	34	**1051–68**
	35	**1069**
	36	**1066, 1069**
	37	**1064–7**
	39	**790** *a*
	43	**598** *b*
16	12	**896** *d*

LUKE

1	5	**578**
	54	**809**
	69	**809**
2	24	**594** *a*, **685** *b*
	46	**709** *b*
3	2	**850**
	4	**830** *a*
	21	**579, 597–605**; **610–52**
	21–2	**554–724**
	22	**662–84, 717, 786–816**; **850–64**
	23	**709** *c*, *d*
6	12	**630** *a*
	16	**928** *a*
	36	**1022**
7	2	**809**
	7	**809**
	26–7	**830–1**
	27	**839**
8	10	**660**
	30	**680** *a*
	32	**680** *a*
9	8	**872–4**
	19	**841, 873–4**
	20	**789–90**
	23	**928** (i) *a* foll., **928** (viii)

LUKE

		PAR.
9	27	**646** *a*, **660**
	28	**630** *a*
	29	**864** *b*
	30–33	**877–9**
	31	**878**
	32	**879** *b*, **884**
	33	**865** foll., **883** *b*, **885** foll.
	34	**885** *a*
	35	**786** foll.
	62	**928** (iii) *b*
10	1	**1015** *b*
	17–21	**922** *a*
	21	**923** *a*, *b*, **984**, **1003** *a*, **1014**
	24	**660**
	27	**928** (ii)
	29–33	**928** (ii)
11	1	**967**
	2	**965–71** (viii)
	29	**931** *b*
	49	**831** *a*
12	49–50	**978** *a–f*; **1010** *d*
14	26–7	**928** (i) *a*, **928** (iv), (x)
15	17	**680** *a*
17	6	**764**
18	7	**933** *c*
	30	**928** (iv)
19	42	**1013** *a*
22	3	**680** *a*, **986** *a*
	16, 18	**934–6**
	22	**983** *a*, **985**
	27	**925**
	31	**891** *a*
	40	**942** foll.
	42	**929–31** foll., **976** foll.
	43–4	**958** foll., **989**
	46	**960** *c*
	46–7	**941** foll.
	51	**1062, 1066**
	53	**947** *a*
23	26	**928** (x) *c*
	34	**1056, 1066–8**
	35	**788**
	37	**788**
	44–6	**1052–69**
	45	**1066**
	47	**790** *a*
24	19	**841**
	25	**841**

JOHN

1	1	**793** *c*, **851** *b*
	6	**593**

JOHN

		PAR.
1	23	**830** *a*
	25	**829**
	26	**558** *a*
	28	**610–6**
	28–34	**553–724**; **854–64**
	29	**576, 577** *a*
	31	**863** *a*
	32	**594**
	32–3	**646–52**; **662–84**; **723–4**
	33	**593–4**; **855–61**
	34	**593, 791, 815–6**
	36	**904**
	38	**653**
	41	**894**
	42	**719, 891** *a*
	45	**1026**
	50	**653**
	51	**640–61**
2	21	**1019**
3	7	**883** *b*
	8	**722**
	13	**722**
4	29	**894**
5	39	**892**
6	15	**630** *a*
	37	**934**
	66	**891** *b*
	67	**891** *b*
	67–9	**870**
	68	**892–5**
	69	**789, 816** *a*, **893–4**
	70	**891** *a*, **986** *a*
7	19	**937**
	30	**937**
	45	**939** *b*
8	35	**724**
	43, 46	**939** *b*
	55	**937**
	59	**558** *a*, **1013** *a*
10	16	**1016**
11	9	**979** *d*
	33	**920**
	51–2	**1016**
12	1	**1120**
	5	**939** *b*
	19	**1016**
	24–6	**928** (x)
	27	**917** foll., **920, 933, 937–40, 954** *b*, **1010** *f*
	27–33	**1003** foll.
	28	**913, 1011, 1020, 1024**
	28–9	**728** *a*

JOHN

		PAR.
12	29	**775** *a*, **954** *a*
	36	**1013**
	38	**971** (vii) *a*
	41	**1020**
13	3	**983** *a*
	21	**920**, **986**
	27	**680** *a*
	37	**939** *b*
14	2	**998**
	8	**1027**
	9	**939** *a*
	30–1	**947** *a*
15	20	**928** (x)
16	32	**937**
17	1	**913**, **970**
	2	**970**
	6	**970**
	8	**970**
	11	**672**, **894** *a*
	12	**970**, **983** *a*, **987**
	15	**940** *a*, *d*, **970**
	17, 19	**970**
	25	**672**, **894** *a*
18	8	**1066**
	11	**933–6**, **979** *c*, *d*, **1007**
20	22	**671**
	31	**990** foll.
21	2	**1015** *b*
	15–17	**913** *a*
	24	**1118**
	25	**990** foll.

ACTS

2	17	**672** *b*
3	13	**809**
	22–5	**845** foll.
	26	**809**
4	25	**800**, **809**
	27	**809**
	30	**809**
6	5	**1015** *b*
	15	**880** (n.)
7	37	**842**
	56	**646** *a*
8	26	**1015** *d*
	39	**1015** *d*
	40	**1015** *d*
9	7	**775** *a*
15	10	**928** (vii) *a*
20	35	**997** *b*
21	8	**1015** *c*
22	9	**775** *a*
26	14	**928** (iii)

ROMANS

		PAR.
4	25	**927** *a*
8	15	**979**
	26	**685** *c*
	32	**927** *a*
	38	**658**
11	11	**1014**
	25	**1014**
	35	**928** *a*
12	1	**883**

1 CORINTHIANS

2	8–10	**641**
4	4, 9	**605** *a*, **658**
6	3	**658**
9	4, 5	**979** *c*
11	10	**658**
	23	**928**

2 CORINTHIANS

1	10	**940** *c*
3	3–13	**882**
	17	**724**, **883** *b*
5	21	**605** *a*
11	14	**962**

GALATIANS

2	9	**764** *c*
	20	**927** *a*
4	4	**587**
	6–7	**979**
	25	**1015** *f*
5	1	**928** (vii) *a*
	13	**928** (iii) *a*

EPHESIANS

5	2	**927** *a*
	14	**884**
	25	**927** *a*
6	12	**962** *a*

PHILIPPIANS

2	6, 7	**601**, **810** *a*, **896** *d*, **928** (vi)
	9	**915**

COLOSSIANS

1	17	**879** *b*
	19	**571** *a*, **665**
2	9	**571** *a*, **665**

1 THESSALONIANS

1	10	**940** *c*

2 THESSALONIANS

		PAR.
3	3	**940** *d*

1 TIMOTHY

1	7	**1146** *d*
3	16	**655**
4	8	**665** *b*
6	16	**1021** *b*

HEBREWS

1	5	**793** *c*
	6	**655–6**
3	5	**807** *c*
5	5–7	**957–964**
7	9	**1015** *f*
10	37	**839** *a*
12	21	**885** *a*

1 PETER

1	1	**1016**
	12	**659** *b*
	24	**850** *b*
2	9	**1126**
4	12	**978** *b*
	14	**660** *a*
5	11	**1021** *b*

"2 PETER[1]"

1	18	**981** *b*
	19	**785** *b*
3	5	**879** *b*

1 JOHN

3	2–3	**907** *a*
5	16	**987**
	18	**940** *d*

JUDE

	14	**839** *a*

REVELATION

1	4	**668** *a*
2	20	**1064** *a*
3	1	**668** *a*
	8	**646** *a*
4	5	**668** *a*
5	6	**668** *a*
12	5	**704** *b*

[1] See also Appendix V, *passim*.

II

INDEX OF SUBJECT-MATTER (ENGLISH AND GREEK)

[*The references are to paragraphs, indicated by black numbers.*]

Aaron, "the Saint of the Lord," **812** *c*, **893**

Abide, Jn prefers "a." to "rest", in describing the resting of the Spirit, **714**

Abraham, "a voice as from A.," **795**

Aenon, **615**, **616** *a*

Akibah, **675**, **783**; his martyrdom, **928** (v)

"And", Heb. *vaw*, "but", **937**; "in order to", **598**; "even", **818**, **834**

"Andrew", typical meaning of the name, **1015** *e*, *f*

"Angel" = "Messenger" in Heb. and Gk, **817** *a*; altered to "Holy One", **839**; angel of the Lord, "an" or "the", **663**; "an a. hath spoken to him," **954**; the a. strengthening Jesus, **958**; wrestling with Jacob, **959**; an a. called the Prince of Esau, *i.e.* Edom or Rome, **961** *a*; "an a. of the Lord" (Acts viii. 26), **1015** *d*

Angels, in bad sense, **658**; in Heb. i. 6 corresponds to Ps. xcvii. 7 "[?false] gods", **656**; "a. of the face," **567** *a*; "of God", **655**, **659–61**; "seven", **668** *a*; "seventy", **668** *a*; agents of God's wrath, **900**

Answered, parall. to "rejoiced", **923** *a*

Antiochus, confused with Antioch, **730** *a*

Apocryphal works, early, **994**

Apostles, **1015**, **1136** foll.

Appearance, "in its a.", rendered (R.V.) "in his eyes" (Lev. xiii. 5, 37), **717**

"Appeared (as)", ambiguity of, **849**, **871–2**

Aramaic, said to have been used in the temple, **730** *a*

Arians, the, **1001**

Arm of Jehovah, the, **971** (vii)

Article, the, in Gk or Heb., **663**, **669** *a*

Axe, the, metaphor of, **704** *a*

Azotus, **1015** *d*

ἀγάπαις, confused with ἀπαταις, **1129**

ἀγαπητός, **786–816**, **811** *a*

ἀειδής, **558** *a*

ἀήρ, **643**

-αι interchanged with -ε, **976** *a*, *b*

αἱρετίζω, **813** *a*

ἀλλά, "but", read as ἄλλο, "another", **978** *d*; ἀλλά in Mk = πλήν in Mt.-Lk., **1010** *c*

ἀναβαίνω, "go up" in Mk iv. 7, 8, 32 = "grow up", **704** *e*; ἀνέβη interchanged with ἀνήφθη, **634** *b*

ἀνάβασις, **629** *b*

ἀναπαύομαι, "rest" or "cease", **712**

ἀνέξω, parall. to συνέχομαι, **1010** *d*

ἀνήφθη, **978** *c*; interchanged with ἀνέβη, **634** *b*
ἀνοίγω, **641** *a*; ἀνεῳγότα, **640** *a*, **646** *a*
ἀνυπόδετος, **901** *c*
ἀπάταις, confused with ἀγάπαις, **1129**
ἀπό and ἐκ, primary distinction between, **940** *c*; ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ = "*of* (not *from*) N.," **598** *b*
ἀρετή applied to God, **1135** *a*
ἄροτρον, **928** (iii) *b*
ἀροτρόπους, **928** (iii) *b*
ἄρχω, "begin" or "reign", **709** *d*
ἀφείς, the regular meaning of, **1064**
ἄφες, adopted as a Heb. word, **1066** *b*; confused with ἄφεσις, **1066** *b*
ἄφεσις, "forgiveness", confused with ἄφες (Ezek. xlvii. 3), **1066** *b*
ἀφίημι = "forsake", "forgive", "let go", "utter (a cry)", **1056**, **1065–6**; parallel to ἐῶ, **1066** *a*

Back, the, of God, **896**, **901** *a*
Backward or behind, to go, **891** *b*
Baptism, The Baptism of Christ symbolical of the bestowal of priesthood, **797** *b*; "b. by fire", not a Jewish phrase, **856** *a*; "b. with the Holy Spirit," not a Jewish phrase, **856**; b. synonymous with "cup" and "fire", **978** *b*
Baptize with the Holy Spirit, not a Jewish phrase, **856**
Barabbas, **928** (i) *e*
Bar Kochba or Koziba, **667**, **783**
Bath Kol, **725–85**; from the midst of the earth, **741**; seldom described as simply *Kol*, **741** *a*; said to be substituted for "Holy Spirit", **743**; words of Scripture uttered by, **743** *d*; Jewish definition of, **780**; as an echo, **780–5**; subjective in Jn xii. 29 and Acts xxii. 9, but never in the Talmuds, **775** *a*; chiding Solomon, **825**; regarded by Jn as an inferior sign, **1005**; "One does not trouble oneself about Bath Kol," **762–75**
Beautify, Exod. xv. 2 "I will beautify him (God)," how explained, **1022**
"Beloved Son", **786–816**
Beloved, a mistranslation of "chosen", **802–4**
Ben Zoma, **687–8**, **913**
Bethabara, **555**, **612–6**
Bethany, **555**, **612–6**
Bethara, **612–6**
Betharabah, **555**, **613** *a*, **616** *a*
Bethel, **960** *a*
Beth Gadia, **616** *d*
Betrayed, in 1 Cor. xi. 23, should be "delivered up", **928**
Bodily, Lk. iii. 22 "in a b. form," **717**; "the fulness of the Godhead b.," **571** *a*, **665**
Boy, (?) "son" or "servant", **806–11**
Branch, The, a name of the Messiah, **1019**, comp. **570**, **704**
Brocken apparitions, **866**
Build, the Messiah to "build the Temple", **1019**
"Building", in Jewish tradition, **1019**
"But" or "and", Heb. *vaw*, **937**; "but" confusable with "for" in transl. from Heb., **1068** *a*

βαλών, substituted for ἐπιβαλών, **928** (iii) *b*

Caiaphas, like Balaam, **1016**
Caleb and Joshua at the Assumption of Moses, **897**
Caligula, alleged Bath Kol concerning, **732**
"Called" confusable with "was called", **638** *a*
"Came", confusable with "upon" in Heb., **851**
Carpenter, Christ "being supposed a c.," **558** *b*
Celsus, on the Baptism of Christ, **560–5**
Cephas, a name preserved by no Gospel but the Fourth, **891** *a*
Cerinthus, on "the Dove", **584**, **589**, **689**, **722**
Choose, interchangeable with "be well pleased", **863**; first Biblical mention of God's "choosing", **812** *c*

"Chosen", a title of Messiah, **786–816**; retained by Luke alone in the Transfiguration, **791**; mistranslated as "Beloved", **802–4**; how explained by Epiphanius, **815** *a*; might represent Heb. בר "son", **860**; in the Book of Enoch, **864**; a name of Tabor, **981** *a*; "Saul, the Chosen of the Lord," **783** *a*, **803** *b*
Christ, "the Christ" a title likely to supersede unfamiliar terms, **790**
Chrysostom, on the miraculous phenomena of the Baptism, **648**
Conquest, meaning of in O.T. and N.T., **1015** *d*, **1018**
Constrained, "I am c.", confusable with "hasten", **1010** *e*
Cross, "taking up the C.," **926**, **928** (i)–(x)
Crown, "stones of a c.," **1018**; "four crowns", **742**
Crucifixion, not a Jewish punishment, **928** (i)
Crying, "strong c. and tears" imputed to Jesus, **957**
Cup, (?) paraphrased by "hour", **956**; (?) conflated with "hour", **1003** *b*; synonymous with "baptism" and "fire", **978** *b*, *f*, **1001**, **1010** *a*; confusable with "furnace", **978** *b*; the Synoptic and Johannine traditions about "not drinking the cup," **933–6**, **1007**

Daniel, praying "about the time of the oblation," **628**
Daughter, "d. of the desert"="ostrich", **716**; "d. of voice", **716**, **725** (see also *Bath Kol*)
David, anointed by Samuel, **650**, **797**
Day, "to-day", perh. meaning "endless and inexhaustible time," **793** *c*
Deacons, the seven, **1015** *b*
Delivered-up, LXX "was d."=Heb. "made intercession", **927**; 1 Cor. xi. 23 R.V. "was betrayed" should be rendered "was d.", **928**
Demas, **891** *b*
Dew, an angel of, **624**; a wind of, **624**; "d. of God", **625**; the Holy Spirit compared to d., **625**
Diatessaron, the Arabic, its relation to Tatian's work, **556**
Divine, "d. nature, virtue" &c., a periphrasis for "God", **1127**
Dove, the, **685–724**; "[turtle] dove" distinguished from "pigeon", **594** *a*, **685**; pictures of, in the Catacombs, **689**; connected with Polycarp's death, **690**; introduced by Aquila without any warrant in the Hebrew, **696**; Mary reared "as a dove", **698**; "dove" confusable with "resting", **695–6**; Wetstein on, **686–7**
Doxology in the Lord's Prayer, the, in the *Didaché* and the *Acts of John*, **1021** *b*, *c*

δέ, perh. changed to ἀλλά read as ἄλλο, **978** *d*
δέομαι, "beseech" or "need", **602**
διαγρηγορῶ, **884** *a*
διὰ τί, never used by Jn except with negative, **939** *b*
διηλλαγμένον, used of the Son's Will, **1001**
δίκρουν, **928** (vii) *e* foll.
δόξα, **896** *c*; "glory" interpr. as "opinion" by Diatess., **878**
δοξάζω, **1022** *a*
δοξασον, perh. corrupted to δοξα σοι, **964** *b*
δοῦλος, interchanged with παῖς, **807** *d*
δύναμις, inserted after δόξα, **660** *a*

Ear, a slave's, why pierced, **928** (iv) *b*
Ebionites, the, Gospel of, **578** foll.
Echo, Bath Kol as an, **780–5**
Eclipsed, "to be e.", confusable with "forsake", **1060**
Edifying, a Pauline term, **1023**
Edom meaning Rome, **961** *a*
Eldad and Medad, **837**
Elders, mentioned by Papias, **995**; an Elder identified with Papias, **998**
"Eli, Eli", **1053**, **1057** foll.

Eliezer, Rabbi, **763–75**; the prayer of, **966**, **1011** *b*
Elijah, "Messenger" or "Prophet", **818**, **826–9**, **834**; with Moses at the Transfiguration, **848–9**, **872–4**; E., Moses, and Enoch, as precedents, **836**; E. praying "at the offering of the oblation," **627**; "Elijah" confusable, in Gk, with "the sun", **1057–60**. See also **1027**
Elisha, **1027**
"*Eloi*, *Eloi*", **1053**, **1057** foll.
Enoch, date of the Book of, **812**
Enoch, Elijah, and Moses, as precedents, **836**
Ephrem (or Ephraemus) Syrus, date of, **573**
Epictetus, the doctrine of, **920**
Eusebius, the Promise of, **1136–49**
Evangelist, Philip the, **1015** *a* foll.
[Evening] oblation, the, **627** foll., **724** *d*
Eyes, "in his e." (R.V. Levit. xiii. 5, 37) rendered (Gesen.) "in its appearance", **717**
Ezra, praying "at the offering of the oblation," **628**

-ε interchanged with -αι, **976** *a*, *b*
ἐγλείπω = ἐκλείπω, **1060**
ἐγρηγορῶ, **945** *c*
εἰς, the Heb. for εἰσῆλθεν εἰς wrongly rendered ἦλθεν ἐπί, **680** *a*; εἴς τινα (after ἔρχομαι &c.) does not mean *to* (or, *on*), but *into* a person, **680** *a*
εἰ, meaning "not", **931** *b*; "if only", "would that", **978** *g*; interchanged with εἴθε, **978** *c*, *g*
εἴθε, **978** *c*, *g*
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς, the Heb. for ἐ. ἐ. wrongly rendered ἦλθεν ἐπί, **680** *a*
εἰσφέρομαι, **1129** *d*
ἐκ and ἀπό, primary distinction between, **940** *c*; σῶσον ἐκ &c., **940** *a*
ἐκλείπειν, **1060** *b*
ἐκλεκτός (ἐκλελεγμένος), **786–816**; a name of Tabor, **981** *a*
ἐκτενέστερον, **959** *a*
ἔκφοβος, **885** *a*, **896** *b*
ἐμπλήσει = Is. xi. 3 (R.V.) "his delight shall be," **666** *a*
ἐνανθρώπησις, **587**
ἐνισχύω, **959**
ἐξέραμα, **1130**
ἐπείγομαι, **978** *d*, **1010** *d*, *e*
ἐπεσχόμην, **1010** *e*
ἐπί, ἦλθεν ἐπί wrongly substituted for εἰσῆλθεν εἰς, **680** *a*
ἐπιβαλών, read as βαλών, **928** (iii) *b*
ἐπιστολαί, **1137** *a*
ἑπτὰ τό, error for ἔπτατο, **668** *b*
ἔπτατο, read as ἑπτὰ τό, **668** *b*
εὐλάβεια[1], Heb. v. 7 "was heard

[1] Εὐλάβεια means "taking good heed to avoid offence," sometimes in a good sense, as when Philo (i. 476–7) praises Abraham for his combination of free speech (Gen. xv. 2 "What wilt thou give me?") with "godly fear" (Gen. xv. 2 "O Lord (ὦ δέσποτα, *i.e.* Master)"); but often in a bad sense, as in Wisd. xvii. 8 (of the Egyptian "*fear worthy to be laughed at*"), and the verb is often thus used with negatives ("Be not *afraid*" &c.). In Prov. xxviii. 14 "Happy is the man that *dreadeth* alway," LXX has καταπτήσσων, "crouching down", softened by the addition of δι' εὐλάβειαν. And so a Greek translator might use εὐλάβεια instead of φόβος to imply that the fear was not cowardly, but the "fear of *doing evil*." But would "fear", *in this negative sense*, be attributed to Christ by an early Evangelist except under a misunderstanding?

Note that in Prov. xxx. 5, Nahum i. 7, Zeph. iii. 12, LXX has εὐλαβοῦμαι as a rendering of a form of חסה "*trust*", confusing it with חסם "*be silent before*", "*be afraid of*". This suggests that the text might be a misinterpretation of "He was heard because he *trusted*."

Westcott says "For the use of ἀπό see Luke xix. 3; xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; xxii. 11: John xxi. 6." But *all these have a negative* ("could *not* for the crowd," "*dis*believed for joy" &c.); *and a negative, or some notion of constraint* (as with the Latin *prae*), occurs in most of the instances of מִן "from", meaning "by reason of", referred to in Gesen. 580 *a*, 583 *a*. More to the point would be Josh. xxii. 24 "we did it *from* carefulness," ἕνεκεν εὐλαβείας, but Aq. ἀπὸ μερίμνης "from anxiety": but neither this, nor any of the instances, is exactly parallel to the present. The preposition points to literal translation from Hebrew, in which case a participial may have been taken for the prepositional prefix (-מִ), as in Ps. lxxii. 12, Job xxix. 12 &c.

(R.V.) for (*ἀπὸ*) his godly fear (*τῆς ἐ.*)," **964** *a*
ἐχέτλη, **928** (iii) *b*
ἐὼ, parall. to *ἀφίημι*, **1066** *a*

ἡλί, or *ἠλί*, **1053** a_1, and see "Eli"
ηλιου, may mean "sun" or "Elijah", **1057–60**, esp. **1060** *a*

θ, see below T

Face, "f. of God", opposed to "back", **898–901**
Face (verb), Mal. iii. 1 (lit.) "shall face", *i.e.* "shall clear from before my face," **830**
Fan, "the winnowing f.", **858**
Father, "Our Father", not freq. in Jewish Prayers, **966** *b*
Fiery (trial), (?) confused with "cup", **978** *b*
"Fire" or "light", **617–25**; fire a hostile element, **624**; "the immaterial f.", **625**; confusable with "fire-offering", **634**; baptism by f., not a Jewish phrase, **856** *a*; interchangeable with "cup", **978** *b*, *f*, **1001**, **1010** *a*
Firmament, the, **644**
Firstborn of God, the, **797**; connection between "chosen" and "firstborn", **799**
Flock of the Gentiles, the, **1018**
"For" (conjunction) and "but", confusable in transl. from Heb., **1068** *a*
"For" (prep.) (Heb. -ל) rendered "to", **927** *b*
Forsake, confusable with "be eclipsed", **1060**
Fountain, "the whole f. of the Holy Spirit," **665**; (Deut. xxxiii. 28) "fountain of"=(Onk.) "according to the likeness of," **717** *a*; "fountain", (?) a name given to a "summary" of prayers, **717** *b*
Freedom, "the spirit of f.," **724**; in 2 Cor. iii. 17, **883** *b–c*
Fuller, (Mk ix. 3) "no f. on earth," **864** *b*, **901** *b*
Fuller's soap, **901** *b*
Fullness, "the f. of the Godhead," **571** *a*, **665**
Furca (Lat.), the yoke of punishment, **928** (i) foll., **928** (vi) (vii) foll.
Furcifer (Lat.), **928** (vi), **928** (vii) *b* foll.
Furnace, confusable with "cup", **978** *b*

φ, see under P

Gadia, "the House of G.," **616** *d*, **734**
"Gaza[1]", "G. this is desert," **1015** *d*
Gennesaret, rabbinical derivation of, **960** *b*; perh. erron. for Gethsemane, **877**, **960**
Gentiles, "the Court of the G.," **981** *b*; "the coming in of the G.," **1014**
Gethsemane, **1004**, **1008**; Gennesaret perh. erron. for G., **877**, **960** *b*
Gibeonites, the, **783** *a*
Glorify, "them that glorify me I will glorify," **913**; "g." interchanged with "hallow", **969–71**, comp. **1011**;

[1] Beside other conflations (**1015** *d*), Acts viii. 26–7 appears to have conflated (1) *εὐνοῦχος* with *δυνάστης* (comp. Jerem. xxxiv. 19 "eunuchs", *δυνάστας*); (2) *εἰς γάζαν* "to Gaza", with "over [all her] treasure" *ἐπὶ* [*πάσης τῆς*] *γάζης* [*αὐτῆς*]. The Eunuch, being (Euseb. ii. 1. 13) "the first" convert "from the Gentiles", appropriately comes from "Aethiopia", because Ps. lxviii. 31 (LXX) "*Aethiopia shall be the first* (*προφθάσει*) to stretch out her hand unto God." In Zeph. ii. 3–4 ("Azah (*i.e.* Gaza) shall be *Azubah*, i.e. *forsaken*") the Targ. has (**1051–6**) *sabach* (for *azab*), which might suggest that "the man of Gaza" was "*forgiven*". Also, instead of "noonday", Targ. has a deriv. of טהר, which may mean "*purify* [*with water*]", suggesting "baptism". The Eunuch, no longer lamenting over himself as (Is. lvi. 3) "*a dry tree*", but being guided to the Man who is (Is. xxxii. 2) "as rivers of *water in a dry place*," exclaims (Acts viii. 36) "Here is water". Receiving life, he departs after God has (Is. lvi. 7) made him "joyful". Philip (Acts viii. 40) "is found in *Azotus*," (?) the city of "No-Life" (L.S. recognize *ἄζωτον* only as "ungirt", but Hesych. adds *ἀβίωτον*): where he continues his life-giving career.

"Glorify thy Name", **913**, **970**, **1011**, **1020**, **1022**
Glory, of Moses, of the Lord &c., **882–4**; of God, **898**; substituted for "goodness", **660** *a*, **899**; paraphrased as "hosts of angels", **900**; the Heb. for, may mean "weight" or "riches", **660** *a*, **1021** *b*; a LXX rendering of Heb. "goodness", **660** *a*, **899**; a periphrasis for "God", **660** *a*; "a weight of g.," **660** *a*; the Gk "glory" interpr. "opinion" by Diatess., **878**; glory, in Jn, regarded as following trouble, **986**; "the power and the glory," **1021** *a–b*; Mk x. 37 "in thy glory", parall. to Mt. xx. 21 "in thy kingdom", **1021** *b*; see also **1021** *c*
Goad, mistranslated "plough", **928** (iii) *b*; "kick against the g.," **928** (iii)
God, periphrases for, *e.g.* "Glory", "Heaven", "Name" &c., **660** *a*
Gods, false, **658**
Going up, confused with "offering", **629** *c*
Goodness, rendered by LXX "glory", **660** *a*, **899**
Gospel of the Ebionites, **578**; of the Hebrews or Nazarenes, **570** foll.; the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, **658**; (?) "according to the Apostles," **600** *b*
Greece, called Javan, **696** *a*; (Zech. ix. 13) "thy sons, O Greece," **1018**
Greeks, come to Jesus, **921**, **1014–6**, comp. **1020** *c*

γινώσκω, aorist of, **1068**
γραφαί, meaning of, **1145–6**
γρηγόρησις, **635** *a*
γρηγορῶ, **945**

Hallow, interchanged with "glorify", **969–71**, comp. **1011**
Hands, "lay h. on", **611** *b*
Hasten, confusable with "be constrained", **1010** *e*
"Hate", applied to parents, **928** (iv), (x)
"Hear ye him", **817–49**
Heaven, a periphrasis for "God", **660** *a*; "of Heaven" interchanged with "Most High", **971** (vi); "the heaven opened", **641**
Hebrews, the, Epistle to, **1139**; Gospel of, **570**
(H)eli, aspiration of, **1053** a_1
Hellenists, the, **1015** *a*
Hermon, **867** *a*, **981**, **1060** *c*
Herod, erroneously mentioned, **578** *a*
Hezekiah, his prayer, **989**
Hide, Jesus "was hidden", **1013**
High, "Most High", **971** (vi), interchanged with "of Heaven" (*ib.*)
Highpriesthood, **893** *a*
Hillel, **734–8**; the Bath Kol for H. against Shammai, **756–62**; "the House of H.," **616** *c*
Holy, "the Holy One" in Clem. Rom. substituted for "angel", **837**; "the Holy One of God," **893–4**; see "hallow"
Horns (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35), **882**, **896**
Hour, (?) a paraphrase of "cup", **956**; (?) conflated with "cup", **1003** *b*
House of, meaning "the followers of", **616** *c*

I AM, how expanded by Jer. Targum, **1024** *a*
If, implying a negative, **956**; meaning "if only", "would that!" **978** *g*
Intercession, Heb. "made i.", LXX "was delivered up", **927**
Interrogative pronouns, variation of, **1146** *c*
Isaac, the Sacrifice of I., **928** (i) *b*; **1069** (i)–(v); carrying the wood, **928** (i) *b*
Isaiah, his martyrdom, **928** (v); Mark's use of the name, **833**, **839** *a*
Israel, "the hardening of I.," **1014**

ἴκριον, **928** (vii) *d*, **928** (x) *b*
ἵνα τί, not used in Jn, **939** *b*

Jabneh, **735**; the synedrion of J., **761**

Jacob at Bethel, **659**; wrestling with the angel, **959**; accused by Satan, **961**
Javan, *i.e.* Greece, **696** *a*
Jesse, the name, confusable with "aged", **706** *c*; "a weaver of the veil of the house of the sanctuary," **709** *a*
"Jesus" interchanged with "John" in the Ebionite Gospel, **581**; Jesus, or Joshua, son of Nun, **832**, **846**, cp. **961** *a*
Jews, Christian, prepossessions of, **963**
John (the Baptist), described himself as being a Voice, **864**
John (the Evangelist), his style, **1120**; its apparent simplicity, **913** *a*; he does not dislike ambiguity, **939** *c*; intervenes where Luke omits or alters Mark, **656**
"John" (the name), interchanged with "Jesus" in the Ebionite Gospel, **581**; interchanged with "Jona(h)", **719**; rendered "Ονιας", **616** *c*; perh. an error for "Jordan", **563** *a*, **565**, **610**, **611** *b*, **1039** *a*
John Hyrcanus, **566**, **569**, **730**
"Jonah", a Heb. noun for "dove", **719**; interchanged with "John", **719**
Jonathan ben Uzziel, **739** *a*
"Jordan", perh. corrupted to "John", **563** *a*, **565**, **610**, **611** *b*, **1039** *a*; perh. taken as "going down", **611**; the water of J. to be rejected, **615**
Joseph, his "rod", **697–710**
Joshua, **897**, **961** *a*; one of "the former Prophets", **797** *e*; Joshua or Jesus, the son of Nun, **832**, **846**, cp. **961** *a*
Joshua ben Chananya, **763–75**
Judas Iscariot, **985** foll.
Kingdom, "the K. of God is within you," **971** (iv); "the yoke of the K.," **928** (ii); "No blessing in which there is not the K.," **1005** *a*; Mt. "in thy kingdom" parall. to Mk "in thy glory", **1021** *b*

καθαρὸν πῦρ, **625** *a*
καθεύδειs[1] (Mk xiv. 37), corrupted, **960** *c*
καθώs, confused with καλῶs, **951**
καί might mean (Heb. *vatw*) "and" or "even", **818**, **834**; "and" or "but", **933** *a*, **937**; "for" or "but", **1068** *a*
καιρόs, "time of trial", **956** *a*
καλῶs, confused with καθώs, **951**
κρίσις βλασφημίαs, "a charge of blasphemy," **1129**

Laban, the egotist, **928** (iv) *a*
"*Lama*" or "*Lema*", *i.e.* "why?" possible corruptions of, **1061**
Lamb, "the L. that taketh away sin," **636**
Legend, Jewish, **1069** (i)–(v)
Leper, purifying of a, **585**
"Lifting up", in John, **928**; comp. **1003** *c*, **1018**, **1020** *b*
Lightfoot, Bishop L.'s interpretation of the Promise of Eusebius, **1136** *a*
Likeness, Deut. xxxiii. 28 (Onk.) "according to the l. of," = (R.V.) "fountain of", **717** *a*
Luke, his style, **850**
Lulab, a, **1022**

λ, *i.e.* "thirty", perh. dropped, **587** *a*
λάκκοs, name of Tabor, **981** *a*
λησταί, **928** (i) *e*

[1] As an illustration of (**960**) John's feigning sleep, comp. the story (no doubt as true as it is beautiful) about Bernard of Quintavalle (*Little Flowers of St Francis*, p. 2) "first companion of St Francis," who was at that time reckoned "the fool of Assisi." Bernard was entertaining Francis as his guest for the night, and (*Sons of St Francis*, p. 31) "the host fought against sleep, also feigning unconsciousness, watched, and saw his guest rise and spend the night in prayer, ...till morning broke. By the light of the little chamber lamp *he had seen the fool transfigured.* Bernard that night left all his former life behind him." The narrative also illustrates what might have happened to the two guests of the Lord Jesus who (Jn i. 39) "abode with him that day, it was about the tenth hour"; and it suggests how some kind of physical "transfiguration"—but very different from the common conception of it—might be combined with special spiritual energy.

Macarius, his comment on the accounts of the Crucifixion, **1051** *a*
Mahanaim, **659** *a*
Majority, vote of the (Exod. xxiii. 2), **763, 767**
Malachi, his reference to the "Temple", **862**; on the "Messenger", **818, 826–9** foll.
Marcosians, the, **978** *d*
Mark writes what may be called "a note-book Gospel", **996**; said to have been Peter's "interpreter", **997**
Martyrdom, of Akibah, **783, 928** (v), of Isaiah, **928** (v)
Mary (the Lord's mother), referred to as "the root" in Is. xi. 2, **669** *b*; reared "as a dove", **698**; makes a veil for the Temple of the Lord, **709** *a*; the "choosing" of, **815** *a*
Matthew, prepossessed by prophecy, **996**; said to have written his Gospel in Hebrew, **997**
Maxims, "not maxims wanted, but men," **1000**
Melchizedek, **893** *a*
Menahem, name of the Messiah, **704** *b*
"Messenger" and "Angel", identical both in Heb. and in Gk, **817** *a*
"Messenger" and "Prophet", **817–49**; Mal. iii. 1 "Behold, I send my m.," **818, 826–35** foll.; Exod. xxiii. 20 "I send a m.," **820–4**; Philo on, **822**
Messiah, the, titles of, **790**; builder of the Temple, **1019**
Metamorphose, **883** foll., **896, 896** *c*, *d*; rarity of the word, **883**
Metamorphosis of Satan into a sparrow, **688**
Metatron, the, **824**
Michael, **961** *a*
Minchah, oblation, **633–6, 627** *a*, **724** *d*
Misinterpretation in the synagogue, **997** *a*
Misquotation, in Mk i. 1–3, Mt. xi. 9–10, Lk. vii. 26–7, **830–1**; in Acts iii. 22 foll., **845**
Moses, "a prophet like unto M.," **825–46**; the Assumption of M., **897**; the Mosaic Theophany, **896–907**; M. "received the Torah from Sinai," **1136**; the name, alleged to mean "a great teacher", **871** (but see **871** *a*); the glory of M., **882**; Moses with Elijah at the Transfiguration, **848–9**; "Moses and the Prophets," **870**
Most High, interchanged with "of Heaven", **971** (vi)
Mountain, the, connected with prayer, **630** *a*; the M. of the Transfiguration, **867** *a*, **981**; "the M. of the House," **981** *b*; "a rooter up of mountains," **764** *a*
"My", the freq. use of, rebuked by Philo, **928** (iv) *a*

μεσημβρία, "south" or "noonday", **1015** *d*
μετασχηματίζεσθαι, **896** *d*
μή interrogative, **933** *e* foll., **979** *c*
μοναί (Jn xiv. 2), **998**
μορφή, "essential form", contrasted with *σχῆμα*, "fashion", **810** *a*, **896** *d*; in Theod. means (Heb.) "brightness", **896** *c*

Nail, a, used as a charm, **778**
Name, a periphrasis for "God", **660** *a*, **1022**; the Name, **915, 964** *b*; Name or Shechinah, **971** (iii); "thy (or, the) Holy Spirit" substituted for "thy (or, the) Name", **968, 971** (iii); Name of Glory, **660** *a*; "Name" compared with "Son", **1005**; "in my n.", a corruption from Exod. xxiii. 21, **823**
Nathanael, **661**
Nations, seventy, **668** *a*
Nazarene, a, **571**; "Gospel of the Nazarenes," **570** foll.
Nazer or Branch, the, **570, 704**
Negative, Heb., confused with personal pronoun, **779** *a*

Oblation, "the [evening] o.", **627** *a*, **724** *d*; "the going up of the o.," **629–39**; connected with Ezra, Daniel, and Elijah, **627–30**

Offering, confused with "going up", **629** *c*. See also "oblation"
Omens, **778**
"Opinion", substituted for "glory" by Diatess., **878**
Origen, on the place of the Baptism, **612–3**; on the Transfiguration, **869–74**
"Original", the term, how used in this book, p. xxxvi (*c*)
Oven, "the o. of a snake," **765**

ο, interchanged with ω, **960** *a*, *d*, **966** *a*, **1015** *c*
ὅ, (?) replaced by τί, **1010** *c*
οἰκειότερον, (?) "more particularly" or "more suitable", **1143** *a*
ὄνομα, ins. for, or with, πνεῦμα, **660** *a*; Phil. ii. 9 τὸ ὄ. τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄ., **915**
ὀπίσθια, "τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ", of Christ in the Transfiguration, **901** *b*
ὀπίσω, **891** *b*
ος, for ως, **966** *a*
οὐ, (?) wrongly translated by R.V. in Mk xiv. 36, **931** *h*, comp. **1010**
οὐ μή (Epict. iii. 22. 33), **933** *b*
οὐ μὴ πίω (Jn xviii. 11), **933–6**, **979** *c*, *d*, **1007**

ω, interchanged with ο, **960** *a*, *d*, **966** *a*, **1015** *c*
ὠνείδισας, D's reading in Mk xv. 34, **1055**
ως, written ος, **966** *a*

Papias, **995–8**, **1147** foll.
Passover, "this P. is our Saviour," **630** *b*
Paul the Apostle, favours the subjective hypothesis of the Transfiguration, **880**
Penuel, Jacob wrestling in, **961**
Perfect participle, in Jn, **646** *a*
Peter the Apostle, his confession, **894**; his saying (Mk ix. 5) "three tabernacles", **868** foll.; "not knowing what he said," **885** foll.; said by Papias to have had an "interpreter", **997**; his vision, **1025**; the "Second Epistle of P.," **1116–35**, **1139**
Phemé, compared with Bath Kol, **731**, **733**
"Philip", (?) meaning of the name, **1015** *e*, *f*
Philip the Apostle and Philip the Evangelist, **1015** *c*; early confusion between the two, **1015** *a*; Philip at Azotus, **1015** *d*
Pillar(s), name given to a Rabbi, **764** *c*, **943**; to Apostles, **943**; "the pillars of Caesarea wept," **764** *c*; "pillars" or "attendants", **764** *d*; confusable with "standing up" or "praying" or "with me", **943–4**
Pittacium (Lat.), **784** *a*
Ploughs, and yokes, "restored by the Messiah," **704** *b*; "made by Christ as a carpenter," **558**, **928** (iii)
Pluperfect, non-existent in Hebrew, **1068** *b*
Polycarp, his Martyrdom, **690**
Power, "the power and the glory," **1021** *a–b*
Prayer, perh. implied in "oblation", **630**; the Voice from Heaven an answer to prayer, **908–1028**; Christ's One Prayer, **929–79**; Lord's Prayer, the first clauses of, **965** foll., **971** (vii); the eighth clause, treated by Tertullian as an interpretation, **971** (i); the Long Johannine Prayer refers to the Synoptic Lord's Prayer, **970**
Prayers, taught by Rabbis for use in travel and danger, **967**
Praying, implied in "standing upright", **944**; confusable with "pillars" and "with me", **943**
Press, "I am pressed" confusable with "I press on", **1010** *e*
Prophecy, not quoted but implied, **703**; confusable with "Vision", **853** *a*
Prophet, the term would include Joshua **797** *e*; not included by Justin in his 16 names of Christ **846** *a*; "Prophet" and "Messenger", **817–49**; the Deuteronomic Prophet (Deut. xviii.

15, comp. xxxiv. 10), **817**, **825** foll., **846**; prophets compared with sages, **757**
Ptolemy Philopator, Seleucus said to be an error for, **732** *a*
Purification of the temple, **862**

παῖς, "boy", "son", or "servant", **806** *a*, comp. **805–11**; interchanged with δοῦλος, **807** *d*
παρά, meaning of π., in Celsus' account of the Baptism, **610**, **614**
παραδίδωμι, **927** foll.
παράστασις, Lightfoot's interpretation of, **1139** *a*
παραφέρω[1], **931** *e*, **975–7**, **1007**
παρεισφέρω, **1129** *d*
παρέλθῃ, pass by, *i.e.* surpass, outstrip, conquer, **941** *a*
περιστερά (Lk. ii. 24); distinguished from τρυγών, **594** *a*, **685** *b*
πίω, οὐ μὴ πίω, **933–6**, **979** *c*, *d*, **1007**
πλήν in Mt. Lk. = ἀλλά in Mk, **1010** *c*
πλήρωμα, **571** *a*, **665**
πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Is. xi. 2), exceptional, **669** *a*; πνεῦμα πληρώσεως (Jerem. iv. 12) means "wind of fullness", **674** *a*
προδίδωμι, **928** *a*
προδότης, **928** *a*
πῶς σὺ λέγεις; **939** *a*

φούρκα, **928** (vii) *b* foll.
φωνή = Heb. "word", **852–3**
φωτίσθητε, **635** *a*

[1] (1) L.S. have "*to turn aside*, or *away from*, τὴν ὄψιν π. τινός Xen. *Cyn.* 5. 27; π. τὸν ὀφθαλμόν to look *aside*, Luc. *D. Meretr.* 10. 2; π. τοὺς ὑσσούς *to put* them *aside*, Plut. *Camill.* 41: *to avert*, *put away*, *Ev. Marc.* 12. 14 (? error for Mk xiv. 36, Lk. xxii. 42)." But see the passages. (*a*) Xen. ἡ ποδωκία πρὸς τὸ ἀμβλυωπεῖν αὐτῷ πολὺ συμβάλλεται. ταχὺ γὰρ ἑκάστου παραφέρει τὴν ὄψιν πρὶν νοῆται ὅτι ἐστί seems to mean "The hound's swiftness helps to make him still more dull of vision for *he lets slip past* him the sight of each object in turn before he perceives what it is" [less prob. "his swiftness carries the sight past him," as we should say of an express train]. (*b*) Luc. ἐκεῖνον δὲ ἐρυθριάσαντα κάτω ὁρᾶν καὶ μηκέτι παρενεγκεῖν τὸν ὀφθαλμόν, "[she reported that] the young man blushed and looked down and would no longer *let himself even glance* at her," Reitz "nec amplius eo oculum *adjecisse*." (*c*) Plut. Here π. seems at first sight to mean certainly "put aside." But see the passage. διὸ καὶ μεθιστάμενοι τῶν ἰδίων ὅπλων ἐπειρῶντο τοῖς ἐκείνων συστρέφεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὑσσοὺς παραφέρειν ἐπιλαμβανόμενοι ταῖς χερσίν (?) "So [the Gauls], letting go their own shields [? arms], tried to grapple at close quarters with the shields [? arms] of the Romans, and to *give the slip to* the pila, catching hold [of the shields] with their hands." In view of the very freq. meaning "let slip", "let pass", this might mean that they tried to "*let* the javelins *pass* them" by "*dodging*" them with their *bodies*, and to catch hold of the shields of the Romans with their *hands*: and this view is confirmed by Plut. *Pelop.* 9 π. "let pass" (Field), (not "parry") [L.S. also refer to Plut. *Arat.* 43 "*let slip*", Xen. *Cyn.* 6. 24 (passive) "*slip away*", "*escape*"]. Even if π. in Plut. *Camill.* 41 means "twist aside *from oneself*," it does not shew that π. could mean "remove *from another person*."

Having regard to the fact that L. and S. can quote no better instances than these—and that so able a scholar as Field does not quote either these or any others—to shew that παραφέρω can mean "I *remove* [from some one]," the *onus probandi* seems to lie with those who maintain the customary interpretation of Mk xiv. 36, not with those who deny it.

(2) Athenaeus p. 380 *d*, *e* quotes a discussion on the use of παραφέρω in which a mention of the [passive] "things *served up* [on the table] (παραφερομένων)" leads to the question "where do we find (ποῦ κεῖται) *the* [*active*] *serve-up* (τὸ παραφέρειν)?" A guest gives four instances from *four comic poets*. The first is Aristophanes, π. τὰ ποτήρια "*hand* the *cups*". The second, Sophron, is said to use the word κατὰ κοινότερον ["communi magis notione", but (?) "more sociably", *one* bowl being "handed" or "passed round" among many guests *in common* (κατὰ κοινόν, see L.S.). κατὰ κοινότερον could hardly refer to the style "in a somewhat common fashion"] as follows: παράφερε Κοικόα (edd. κύκλῳ but ?) μεστὸν τὸν σκύφον. In two of these instances, spite of the context, scribes have substituted περιφέρω. These facts suggest that considerations of linguistic fitness may have had some part in inducing Mark to suppose that π., with ποτήριον, could not be used in this vernacular or comic fashion. Hence the text may have seemed to require amending by inserting ἀπ' ἐμοῦ "from me", converting the meaning from "*present* (*to*)" into "*remove* (*from*)".

Quotation, from initial words, **973** *a*

Ram, story of the (Gen. xxii. 13), **1069** (i) foll.
Ransom, "to give his soul a r.," **925**
Red Heifer, the, **615** *a*
Reduplication, Hebrew, **1058**
Refiner, the, **857–64**; ambiguities connected with, **858–61**
Remarriage, sanctioned by Bath Kol, **745–6**
Rest, Jn prefers "abide" to "r." in describing the resting of the Spirit, **714**
Rest(ing), confusable with "dove", **695–6**; means "resting-place", **724** *c*; confusable with "[evening] oblation", **724** *d*; Solomon "a man of r.," **724** *b*
Resting Place, of Jehovah, the Temple, **724** *c*
Rod, Joseph's, **697–710**
Rome or Edom, **961** *a*

Sabach, Mk xv. 34 &c. "forsake", means also "let alone", "pardon", "suffer", **1051–6** foll.
Sabbath, **738**
Samaria, **1015** *d*
Samuel, anointing of David by, **650**, **797**
Samuel the Little, **735**
Satan, accusing Jacob, **961**; cast down from heaven, **922**, **1003** *a*, **1015**; enters into Judas, **986**, **986** *a*; "S." a term applied to Peter, **891** *a*
Saul, Abba, **1022**
Saul, "the chosen of the Lord," **783** *a*
Say, "some *say*" confusable in Heb. with "some *said*", **874** *a*, **1059**, comp. **1002**; "say" = "purpose", **744**
Scent, "to have s.", said of the Messiah, **667**
Scripture, used as *Sortes Biblicae*, **749**
See, "s. the thunders of Sinai," **781** *d*
Seleucus, said to be an error for Philopator, **732** *a*
Seraphim, the, **1020**
Seven, variously connected with "angels", "eyes", "lamps", "spirits", **668**, **668** *a*; the s. deacons, **1015** *b*; the s. loaves and baskets, **1015** *b*
Seventy, s. angels, **668** *a*; nations, **668** *a*; tongues of the world, **781** *d*
Seventy (apostles), the return of, **922**; (?) sent to the Gentiles, **1015**
Sheba, transliterated, **1060** *c*
Shebna, brother of Hillel, **737**
Shema, the, **783**, **928** (ii) *a*, **928** (v)
Shechinah, **734**; corresponds to "the Holy Spirit", **736**; interchanged with "Name", **971** (iii)
Shemaiah and Abtalion, **738**
Sibylline Oracles, **582** foll.
Simeon ben Eliezer, **969**
Simon the Just, **732**
Sinai, the Voice from, **781** *c*; "seeing the thunders of," **781** *d*
Siphra and Siphri, **743** *a*, **1078–9**
Sit, might imply "pause before praying", **944**; confusable with "sleep", **945** *a*; may mean "remain", **945** *d*
Six, spirits, **667–8**; six, variously connected, **668**
Slave (the word), not in O.T. except in Jer. ii. 14, **807** *b*
Slaves, **928** (vi); Philo on "the slavish race", **928** (iv) *a*
Sleep, confusable with "sit", **945** *a*
Snake, "the oven of a s.," **765**
Snatch, "the Spirit snatched Philip," **1015** *d*
Solomon, "a man of rest," **724** *b*
Son, compared with "Name", **1005**; "Beloved Son", **786–816**; "son", in Heb., confusable with "fine [wheat]", **857**; with "chosen", **860**; a mistranslation of "servant", **805–11**; "Son of God", **661**; "Son of man", **661**
Soul, "loving God with one's s.," **928** (v)
Sower, Parable of the, **1019**; tradition about, **998**
Sparrows, our Lord's saying about s. (Mt. x. 29) prob. not copied in Jewish tradition, **748** *a*

"*Specula*" (Lat.), *i.e.* "do the work of a *speculator*," "despatch", **748** *a*
Spirit, the Holy, "the whole fountain of," **665**; Jn's doctrine about, **671**; in j. Talm. corresponds to the Shechinah in b. Talm., **736**; Bath Kol said to be substituted for, **743**; "the Spirit" (absolutely), a title freq. in N.T., rare in O.T., **672**; the descent of, connected with Is. xi. 2, **666**; the resting of, **714** *a*; Is. xi. 2 "[the] Spirit of the Lord," mistransl. by LXX "[a] Spirit of the God," **669**; elsewhere mistransl. or om. by LXX, **675**; "Thy (or, the) Holy Spirit" substituted for "Thy (or, the) Name," **968**, **971** (iii)
Spirits, "six" or "seven", **664–9**; called "the powers enumerated by Isaiah," **557** *a*; "seven s." connected with the "seven lamps" in the tabernacle, **668** *a*; "spirits, or winds, four," **668** *a*
Stand (Heb.), its local and metaphorical meanings, **945**; "standing upright" implies "praying", **944**; confusable with "pillars" and "with me", **943**
Stature, metaphorically used, **883** *c*
Stephen, **871**, **1015** *c*
Stoic dogma, **920**; Stoic maxims, **1000**
Stream, *i.e.* river, confusable with N. Heb. "light", **635**
Successions, of the Apostles, **1136** foll., **1142** *a*
Sun, confusable with "Elijah" in Gk, **1057–60**, esp. **1060** *a*
Sword, metaph., **1015** *d*, **1018**

σανίς, **928** (vii) *c* foll., **928** (x) *a*
σειροῖς, **1129** *c*
στάσις, **928** (i) *e*
σταυροκόμιστος, **928** (vii) *e* foll.
σταυρός[1], **928** (i)–(x)
στήριγμα, *στήριγξ*, **928** (vii) *b*, foll.
συνεστώς, how used in Lk. ix. 32, **879** *b*; its meaning elsewhere, **879** *b*
συνέχομαι, parall. to *ἀνέξω*, **1010** *d*
σχῆμα, "fashion", contrasted with *μορφή*, "essential form", **810** *a*, **896** *d*
σχίζω, **641** *a*

Tabernacles, "the three T." (Mk ix. 5), **868** foll., **891–5**
Tabor, **867** *a*, **981** *a*
Talmud, Jerusalem contrasted with Babylonian, **762**, **783** *c*, **785** *a*
Tamar, Bath Kol on, **740**, **743** *c*
Targum, meaning of, pp. ix—x
Tatian, his Diatessaron, **556**
Tears, "strong crying and t." imputed to Jesus, **957–64** *a*
Temple, the, **1017–20**
Tempus (Lat.), "time of trial", **956** *a*
Teraphim, transliterated, **1060** *c*
Testament of the XII Patriarchs, **566**
"The" (Heb.) dropped before a noun defined by a genitive, **663**
THEY, *i.e.* God, the powers of heaven, **667** *a*, **738** *a*
Thirty (λ) perh. dropped, **587** *a*; "t. years old", applied to Mary and to David, **709** *c d*; "t. years old" = (Heb.) "son of 30 years," **709** *d*
Thunder(s), **727–9**, **781** *c*; "seeing the t. of Sinai," **781** *c d*
Transfiguration, the, Physical Hypothesis of, unsatisfactory **865–7**; Voice at, why omitted by Jn? **865–907**; Origen's view of, subjective, **869–74**; in *Acts of John*, **877**; a Jewish comment on, **881**; tradition on, in Clem. Alex., **881**; the subjective hypothesis is favoured by St Paul, **880**; the Voice at, in "2 Pet.", **1131**

[1] As confirmation of the statement (**928** (x) *d*) that Jews would interpret "take up the cross" literally, see Dr Edersheim, *L. of Chr.* ii. 87 "*They*"—*i.e.* the disciples—"*knew the torture which their masters—the power of the world—the Romans, were wont to inflict: such must they*, and similar must we all, *be prepared to bear*, and, in so doing, begin by denying self": and he adds in a footnote, "*In those days the extreme suffering which a man might expect from the hostile power* (*the Romans*) *was the literal cross*; in ours, it is suffering not less acute, the greatest which the present hostile power can inflict: really, though perhaps not literally, a cross." I italicize the words that seem to confirm my thesis.

Transliteration, errors arising from, **1060** *c*
Tree, meaning Cross, **1020** *a*
Trouble, preceding prayer, **908–28**; followed by "glory", **986**, **1020** *b*; "freedom from t.", inculcated by Epictetus, **920**

θεράπων, **807** *c*, **808**

τί, (?) substituted for *ὅ*, **1010** *c*; *τί* prob. "why?" (not "what?") in Jn xii. 27 *τί εἴπω*, **938–40**, comp. **933** *a*
τίθεται ἐπί, "is [a name] attached to," not "is placed on", **928** (vii) *f*
τίνα, meaning "what things", **1142–6**
τίς, *alleged* to be used for *ὅς*, **931** *f–h*
τρυγών (Lk. ii. 24), distinguished from *περιστερά*, **594** *a*, **685** *b*

Uncovered, "with head u.", **883** *c*
Unfamiliar phrases corrupted, **789–90**
Unveiled, "with u. face", **883** *c*
Upon, confusable with "go up", **707** *b*; with "came", **851**; with "yoke", **928** (iii) *c*; "the word of the Lord u.," **850–2**; "disquieted u. me" (Ps. xlii. 5), **918**
Upright (Lev. xxvi. 13) = (Targ.) "with head uncovered", **883** *c*
"Ur-Marcus", p. xxxvi (*c*)

ὑπακούετε, **964**
ὑποστάτης, **928** (vii) *b* foll.
ὑψοῦν, **1003** *c*

Variation of the Interrogative, **1146** *c*
Vaw (Heb.), "and" or "but", **937**; "and" or "even", **818**, **834**; "for" or "but", **1068** *a*
Virtue, "the V. of God," **1126**
Vision, confusion between v. and prophecy, **853** *a*
Voice, "the V. of the Lord" in the Bible, **727–9**; how interpreted by Philo, **727**; the V. at the Baptism, subjective, **864** *a*; John the Baptist calls himself a voice, **864**; V. for "Daughter of Voice", **741** *a*; see *Bath Kol*.
Voices, *i.e.* "thunders", **728**

Wait, "I have waited for thy salvation," **797** *d*
Walking, how interpr. by Philo, **727**
Washing of feet, the, **928** (viii), **986**
Water, "the water from heaven," **625**; "the waters of the Law," **764** *b*
Weaving of the veil, explained mystically, **709** *b*
Well pleased, "to be w.", interchanged with "choose", **863**
Wetstein on "the Dove", **686–7**
"Why?" implies prohibition, **918**; means also "How!" **918**; in Heb. introduces what ought not to be said, **939**
Will, God's Will, **1011**; "Thy will be done," **931** foll., **955** foll.; Tertullian's treatment of the clause, **971** (v)
Wood, meaning Cross, **1020** *a*
Word, variously referred to as "Scriptures" or "Prophets", **953**; "the word of the Lord came," **850**; "according to thy, his &c. word," **949–54**, **993**, **1011** *c*; "words of life", **894**
Works, good, meaning of, **1022** *c*
World, the, its double meaning, **1016**
Writings, "the canonical writings", *i.e.* Bible or N.T., not Epistles alone, **1146**

ξαίνω, "scourge", **928** (v) *a*, **928** (x) *b*
ξύλον, **928** (vii) *b* foll., **928** (x) *b*

Yoke **928** (i)–(x); "taking on oneself the yoke" = repetition of the *Shema*, **928** (ii); "the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven," **928** (ii) *a*; the yoke, preparatory for martyrdom, **928** (v)
Yokes, and ploughs, "restored" by the Messiah, **704** *b*; made by Christ "as a carpenter", **558**, **928** (iii)

Zalmon, **745** *b*
Zechariah, (Zech. ix. 9) "Behold, thy king cometh," **1018**
Zion, the sons of, **1018**

ζυγός = the bondage of the Jewish Law, **928** (vii)

III

INDEX OF SUBJECT-MATTER (HEBREW)

[*The references are to paragraphs, indicated by black numbers*]

1. "c. w." means that one Hebrew word has been *actualiy c(onfused) w(ith)* another; "perh. c." means "*perh(aps) c(onfused)*."

2. "cble w." means that one Hebrew word is *c(onfusa)ble w(ith)* another word, owing to similarity of letters.

אב "father", c. w. אם "if", **979** *b*

אבי "my father", **979** *b*

אבי "O that!" **979** *b*

אחד "one"
אחז "obtain"
אחר "behind" } perh. c., **891** *a*, **1069** (ii)

אי, meanings of, **979** *b*

אי־בי "I am able", cble w. אבי, **979** *b*

אם "if", c. w. אב "father", **979** *b*

אם "if", implying a wish, **985** *a*

בחירי "my chosen", c. w.
ביחידי "in my beloved" } **803** *a*

בי, "I pray", or "in me", **979** *b*

בר, Bib. Heb. "lye", "purity", c. w. N. Heb. "son", **857** *a*

בר "son", "lye", &c., "chosen", **860**

ברוח "with the Spirit"
ברית "soap" } (?) **857**

גלה "reveal", used with אל or ־ל, not על, **971** (vii)

דבר "word", or "hath spoken", **954**

ה־, see "Article"

הוי "woe", cble w.
היה "had been born" } **985** *a*

הרפה "forsake", cble w. חרף "insult, reproach", **1055**

ו, see *vaw*

זקף "crucified", **1003** *c*

חרף "reproach", see הרפה

יון Javan, *i.e.* "Greece"
יונה "dove"
ינה "oppress"
ינוח "he will rest" } c. or cble, **696** *a*

יקר, substituted for כבד, **915** *a*

יקר "be glorious", c. w. קרא "call", **915** *b*

יקרא, (Onk.) "the glory of", (Heb.) קרן "became horned", **896** *c*

ישב "sit", c. w. שכב "sleep", **945** *a*

כבד, means "weight", "riches", "glory", **660** *a*, **1021** *b*; altered to יקר, **915** *a*

כבדך or כבודך "thy glory", cble w. כדברך "according to thy word," **1011** *c*

־ל "for", rendered "to", **927** *b*

לו "to him", c. w. the rare לו "not", **985** *a*; c. w. לא "not", **779** *a*
למא "why?" cble w. מלא "there is fulfilled", **954** *b*

מה "why?" implying negative, **918** *b*
מלא "fulfil", cble w. מלאך (*quod vid.*) "angel" or "messenger", **656** *a*, **954**; cble w. למא "why?" **954** *b*
מלאך "angel" or "messenger", c. w. מלך "king", **656** *a*; cble w. מלא "fulfil", **656** *a*, **954**
מלאכדבר (?) "fulfilled according to the word," or "an angel hath spoken," **954**
מלך "king", c. w. מלאך "angel" or "messenger", **656** *a*
מלכה "kingdom", cble w. מלך "king", **656** *a*
מנהו Ps. lxviii. 23 "from it", should be מנתו (R.V.) "its portion", **977**
מנחה, see **627–39**; "oblation" or "resting", **724** *d*
מנת "the portion of", **977**

נהר (?) (Targ.) מנהר "streamed with light", cble w. (Heb.) מנהר "from the river", **635**
נצה "flower", c. w. נצר "branch" } **708**

עד "unto", c. w. על (*vid. infr.*), **918** *a*
על (*vid. infr.*) c. w. עד "unto", **918** *a*
על "upon", c. w. עלה "go up", **707**; N. Heb. "came", Bib. Heb. "upon", **851**; Bib. Heb. "yoke", cble w. "upon", **928** (iii) *c*; "upon us" (?) in old versions of Lord's Prayer, **971** (ii)—(vii)
עלה "go up", cble w. עלל "come" or "go", **637** *a*; c. w. על "upon", **707**
עלו "they went up", "they went", "they entered", **637** *a*
עליון "O Most High" } cble **971** (vi)
עלינו "on us"
עלל, see עלה
עם "near" or "with", c. w. עם "people", **610–1**
עמד "stand", **945**
עמדי "with me", perh. c. w. עמדים or עמודים "pillars" and עמדים "standing up" } **943**
עמדים, may mean "pillars" or "attendants", **764** *d*
ענה (root), "answer", "sing", "be afflicted", **923** *b*

פיליפי c. w. פליטה } **1015** *c*

קרא "meet" or "call", **1069** *b*; c. w. יקר "be glorious", **915** *b*; c. w. קרב "draw near", **1069** *b*
קרב "draw near", c. w. קרא "call", **1069** *b*
קרן "became horned", cble w. יקרא "the glory of", **896** *c*
קרע "rend", cble w. רקיע "firmament", **644**

שבע "seven", cble w. שבעים "seventy" } **1015** *b*
שוב "(re)turn", also "return (an answer)", **946** *a*
שכב "lie down to sleep," c. w. ישב "sit", **945** *a*

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

R17
1067/54

7115

BS
2555
A3
pt.3

Abbott, Edwin Abbott, 1838-1926.
From letter to spirit; an attempt to reach through varying voices the abiding word. London, A. and C. Black, 1903.
xxxvi, 492p. 23cm. (His Diatessarica, pt.3)

1. Holy Spirit--History of doctrines. I. Title. II. Series.

7115

CCSC/mmb